

1 **LABATON SUCHAROW LLP**
2 Thomas A. Dubbs
3 Carol C. Villegas
4 Jeffrey A. Dubbin (SBN 287199)
5 Aram Boghosian
6 140 Broadway
7 New York, New York 10005

8 *Lead Counsel to Lead Plaintiff and the Class*

9 **MICHELSON LAW GROUP**
10 Randy Michelson (SBN 114095)
11 220 Montgomery Street, Suite 2100
12 San Francisco, California 94104

13 *Bankruptcy Counsel to Lead Plaintiff
14 and the Class*

15 **LOWENSTEIN SANDLER LLP**
16 Michael S. Etkin (*pro hac vice*)
17 Andrew Behlmann (*pro hac vice*)
18 Scott Cargill
19 Nicole Fulfree
20 Colleen Maker
21 One Lowenstein Drive
22 Roseland, New Jersey 07068

23 *Bankruptcy Counsel to Lead Plaintiff
24 and the Class*

25 **UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
26 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
27 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

28 In re:

1 PG&E CORPORATION

2 - and -

3 PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC
4 COMPANY,

5 Debtors.

6 Case No. 19-30088 (DM) (Lead Case)
7 Chapter 11
8 (Jointly Administered)

9 **SECURITIES LEAD PLAINTIFF'S MOTION
10 TO STRIKE DECLARATION OF
11 CHRISTINA PULLO IN SUPPORT OF THE
12 DEBTORS' SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF IN
13 RESPONSE TO THE COURT'S TENTATIVE
14 RULING REGARDING MOTION TO APPLY
15 RULE 7023 AND ORDER SETTING
16 DEADLINE [ECF NO. 5789]**

17 Affects Both Debtors
18 Affects PG&E Corporation
19 Affects Pacific Gas and Electric Company

20 Lead Plaintiff,¹ on behalf of itself and the Class, together with the Securities Act
21 Plaintiffs, hereby moves (the “**Motion to Strike**”), pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 105, for entry of an
22 order striking the *Declaration of Christina Pullo in Support of the Debtors’ Supplemental Brief*
23 in Response to the Court’s Tentative Ruling Regarding Motion to Apply Rule 7023 and Order
24 Setting Deadline (the “**Supplemental Pullo Declaration**”) [ECF No. 5789], which was filed

25

¹ Capitalized terms used but not defined herein have the meanings given in *Securities Lead Plaintiff's Motion to Apply Bankruptcy Rule 7023 to Class Proof of Claim* [ECF No. 5042].

1 after the evidentiary record on *Securities Lead Plaintiff's Motion to Apply Bankruptcy Rule 7023*
2 to *Class Proof of Claim* (the “**Rule 7023 Motion**”) [ECF No. 5042] was already closed, and
3 which was not authorized by the Tentative Ruling (as defined below) or otherwise.² In support
4 of the Motion to Strike, Lead Plaintiff respectfully states as follows:

5 **BACKGROUND**

6 On December 9, 2019, Lead Plaintiff filed the Rule 7023 Motion, seeking entry of an
7 order applying Bankruptcy Rule 7023 to the Class Claims. The Debtors filed an objection to the
8 Rule 7023 Motion (the “**Debtors’ Objection**”) [ECF No. 5369] on January 14, 2020. In support
9 of the Debtors’ Objection, the Debtors filed several declarations, including the *Declaration of*
10 *Christina Pullo (I) Regarding Implementation of the Debtors’ Notice Procedures and (II) In*
11 *Support of the Debtors’ Objection to Securities Lead Plaintiff’s Motion to Apply Bankruptcy*
12 *Rule 7023 to Proof of Claim* (the “**Prior Pullo Declaration**”) [ECF No. 5370].

13 The Court held a hearing on the Rule 7023 Motion on January 29, 2020 (the “**Hearing**”).
14 At the conclusion of the Hearing, the Court took the Rule 7023 Motion under submission. See
15 Transcript of Hr’g Held Jan. 29, 2020, at 96:8-9 (“Okay. Thank you all for your arguments. The
16 matter stands submitted.”).³

17 On February 3, 2020, the Court issued the *Tentative Ruling Regarding Motion to Apply*
18 *Rule 7023 and Order Setting Deadline* (the “**Tentative Ruling**”) [ECF No. 5604], in which the
19 Court ordered Lead Plaintiff and the Debtors “to each file a supplemental brief no later than
20 February 14, 2020, limited to ten pages, containing their respective arguments for why extension
21 of the bar date for [the Class] is not preferable.” Tentative Ruling at 2. The Court further
22 directed that the supplemental briefs “should be narrowly tailored to this issue.” *Id.* The
23 Tentative Ruling did not reopen the evidentiary record in connection with the Rule 7023 Motion,
24 nor did it direct or authorize the parties to submit new evidence, through declarations or
25 otherwise, in connection with their supplemental briefs.

26
27

² The reservation of rights annexed to the Rule 7023 Motion as Exhibit B is incorporated
herein by reference.

28 ³ A copy of the transcript of the Hearing is attached hereto as **Exhibit A** for the Court’s
convenience.

Pursuant to the Court's directive in the Tentative Ruling, the Debtors filed a supplemental brief on February 14, 2020 (the “**Debtors’ Supplemental Brief**”) [ECF No. 5369]. However, contrary to the clear directive in the Tentative Ruling limiting any further submissions to supplemental briefs, the Debtors also submitted the Supplemental Pullo Declaration in an apparent, but impermissible, attempt to expand the factual record on the Rule 7023 Motion. In addition to having been submitted after the closure of the evidentiary record and contrary to the clear directive set forth in the Tentative Ruling, the Supplemental Pullo Declaration also includes a number of statements that directly contradict assertions in the Prior Pullo Declaration and the Debtors’ Objection, including:

Supplemental Pullo Declaration <i>(emphasis added where applicable)</i>	Prior Inconsistent Statement
“While in my experience, and as explained in the Prior Pullo Declaration, providing notice of the bar date to absent members of a class of former securities holders is unprecedented in chapter 11 cases, <i>it would be possible for the Debtors to provide notice</i> of an extended bar date to former securities holders and to allow them to file individual proofs of claim.” ¶ 5	“To the best of my knowledge, providing notice to former securities holders <i>would be time intensive and impossible to complete on an accurate and thorough basis.</i> ” Prior Pullo Declaration, ¶ 19 “Such <i>putative class members are thus unknown creditors. . . .</i> ” Debtors’ Objection, p. 15 “Given the <i>impossibility of identifying all putative class members. . . .</i> ” Debtors’ Objection, p. 15.
“In addition, based on my experience, <i>approximately seven days is a sufficient amount of time for Nominees to cause notice of the bar date and a proof of claim form to be provided to all beneficial holders</i> of the Debtors’ securities during the Class Period.” ⁴ ¶ 7 “ <i>Based on my experience and knowledge of past practice in the industry</i> , a bar date that is set 30 days after the notice is distributed through the process outlined above will be effective to provide holders the opportunity to file a proof of claim in the bankruptcy case.” ¶ 8	“ <i>I am not aware of any instances</i> where notice was effectuated to former holders utilizing a potential securities class date range.” Prior Pullo Declaration, ¶ 18 “Consequently, providing such notice would instead require an active outreach campaign to Nominees and such Nominees either voluntarily providing beneficial holder information to Prime Clerk or coordinating distribution of such notice (which voluntary participation is subject to each Nominee’s unique internal practices regarding class actions and confidential beneficial holder records management). There would be no reliable way to verify whether such notice had been completed accurately and thoroughly by

⁴ The Prior Pullo Declaration states that “I am ***not aware of any instances*** where notice was effectuated to former holders utilizing a potential securities class date range.” Prior Pullo Declaration, ¶ 18 (emphasis added). Thus, it is not clear what new “experience” Ms. Pullo refers to in the Supplemental Pullo Declaration.

Supplemental Pullo Declaration <i>(emphasis added where applicable)</i>	Prior Inconsistent Statement
	<p>each Nominee, who often do not respond to such requests. <i>Such a process would require a significantly longer period of time—likely months—to compile all of the relevant information.</i>” Prior Pullo Declaration, ¶ 19</p> <p>“Based on my experience, it is my belief that <i>it would not be possible to accurately and comprehensively determine which holders of the Debtors’ securities during a specified class period received the Standard Bar Date Notice.</i>” Prior Pullo Declaration, ¶ 20</p> <p>“Any attempt to engage nominees in the process of noticing former securities holders would have delayed Debtors’ noticing procedures and would have been costly and incomplete.” Debtors’ Objection, p. 15</p>

RELIEF REQUESTED

By this Motion to Strike, Lead Plaintiff respectfully requests that the Court strike the Supplemental Pullo Declaration from the record, disregard the Supplemental Pullo Declaration in connection with its consideration of the Rule 7023 Motion, and grant such other relief as the Court deems appropriate under the circumstances.

ARGUMENT

The stark contradictions between the Supplemental Pullo Declaration and the Prior Pullo Declaration make one thing abundantly clear: The Supplemental Pullo Declaration is no more than a brazen, post hoc attempt by the Debtors to alter the record on the Rule 7023 Motion by completely changing Ms. Pullo’s testimony to suit their present purposes. On that basis alone (and in addition to any conclusions the Court may draw regarding the credibility of Ms. Pullo’s testimony), the Court should strike the Supplemental Pullo Declaration.

Suddenly, “it would be possible for the Debtors to provide notice of an extended bar date to former securities holders” – even though Ms. Pullo opined barely a month ago, in an effort to convince the Court that Class members were unknown creditors, that such a notice process supposedly would have been “impossible to complete on an accurate and thorough basis” at the time the Debtors served notice of the original Bar Date. *Compare* Supplemental Pullo Declaration, ¶ 5, *with* Prior Pullo Declaration, ¶ 19. Even though providing Class members with

1 notice of the Bar Date supposedly would have been “time intensive” and taken “likely months”
2 to complete during the 112-day period between entry of the Bar Date Order and the Bar Date,
3 Ms. Pullo now believes instead that “approximately seven days is a sufficient amount of time” to
4 conduct that same process. *Compare* Prior Pullo Declaration, ¶ 19, with Supplemental Pullo
5 Declaration, ¶ 7. In January, Ms. Pullo was “not aware of any instances where notice was
6 effectuated to former holder utilizing a potential securities class date range.” Prior Pullo
7 Declaration, ¶ 18. However, without any explanation for her sudden change of heart, Ms. Pullo
8 now conclusively opines, “based on [her] experience,” that such notice could be provided at
9 lightning speed. Even if the Supplemental Pullo Declaration had been timely submitted or was
10 otherwise permissible, these glaring disparities call its legitimacy into question. In the wake of
11 the Tentative Ruling, the Debtors have now shifted course, attempting to create the impression
12 that giving defrauded investors notice of an extended Bar Date would somehow be preferable to
13 giving them a collective voice through Bankruptcy Rule 7023, as the Court indicated it was
14 inclined to do.

15 In any event, the Supplemental Pullo Declaration was untimely and unauthorized. At the
16 conclusion of the Hearing, the Court deemed the Rule 7023 Motion submitted, thereby closing
17 the evidentiary record. The Debtors did not move to reopen the evidentiary record on the Rule
18 7023 Motion, nor did the Tentative Ruling invite any new declarations or other evidence. *See*
19 Tentative Ruling at 2 (directing the Debtors and Lead Plaintiff to “each file **a supplemental**
20 **brief**”) (emphasis added). Accordingly, the Supplemental Pullo Declaration was untimely and
21 impermissible. *See, e.g., In re Rake*, 363 B.R. 146, 150-51 (Bankr. D. Id. 2007). In a nearly
22 identical procedural context, the *Rake* court disregarded an untimely affidavit submitted when
23 the court permitted parties to file supplemental briefs after the hearing on a motion, finding as
24 follows:

25 Debtor submitted evidence – his supplemental affidavit . . . – after
26 the evidentiary record was closed at the conclusion of the January
9 hearing. ***The Court authorized filing of post-hearing briefs,***
nothing more. Debtor has not requested, and the Court has not
allowed, reopening of the record for additional evidence. The
attempt to add new testimony or cure prior testimonial ambiguity
is improper. The supplemental affidavit will be disregarded.

¹ *Rake*, 363 B.R. at 150-51 (emphasis added). For the same reasons, the Court should strike the
² Supplemental Pullo Declaration.

CONCLUSION

4 For the foregoing reasons, the Court should grant the Motion to Strike.

6 WHEREFORE, Lead Plaintiff respectfully requests that the Court strike the
7 Supplemental Pullo Declaration from the record, disregard the Supplemental Pullo Declaration in
8 connection with its consideration of the Rule 7023 Motion, and grant such other relief as the
9 Court deems appropriate under the circumstances.

Dated: February 18, 2020

Respectfully submitted,

**LOWENSTEIN Sandler LLP
MICHELSON LAW GROUP**

By: /s/ Randy Michelson
Randy Michelson (SBN 114095)

Bankruptcy Counsel to Lead Plaintiff and the Class

- and -

LABATON SUCHAROW LLP

Lead Counsel to Lead Plaintiff and the Class

- and -

WAGSTAFFE, VON LOEWENFELDT, BUSCH & RADWICK, LLP

Liaison Counsel for the Class

- and -

ROBBINS GELLER RUDMAN & DOWD LLP

Counsel for the Securities Act Plaintiffs

- and -

**VANOVERBEKE, MICHAUD & TIMMONY,
P.C.**

Additional Counsel for the Securities Act Plaintiffs

EXHIBIT A
TRANSCRIPT OF JANUARY 29 HEARING

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

-oOo-

In Re:) Case No. 19-30088
PG&E CORPORATION AND PACIFIC) Chapter 11
GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY)
Debtors.) San Francisco, California
) Wednesday, January 29, 2020
) 10:00 AM
)

STATUS CONFERENCE RE:
CONFIRMATION

SECURITIES LEAD PLAINTIFF'S
MOTION TO APPLY BANKRUPTCY
RULE 7023 TO CLASS PROOF OF
CLAIM [5042]

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
BEFORE THE HONORABLE DENNIS MONTALI
UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

For the Debtors: STEPHEN KAROTKIN, ESQ.
RICHARD W. SLACK, ESQ.
Weil, Gotshal & Manges LLP
767 Fifth Avenue
New York, NY 10153
(212) 310-8000

GEORGE E. ZOBITZ, ESQ.
(Telephonically)
Cravath, Swaine & Moore LLP
825 Eighth Avenue
New York, NY 10019
(212) 474-1996

Special Counsel to the ERIC R. TODDERUD, ESQ.
Debtors: (Telephonically)
Berman and Todderud LLP
3502 Fremont Avenue North
Suite 2
Seattle, WA 98103
(206) 279-3272

1 For the Official Committee GREGORY A. BRAY, ESQ.
2 of Unsecured Creditors: Milbank LLP
3 2029 Century Park East
4 33rd Floor
5 Los Angeles, CA 90067
6 (424) 386-4000
7
8 For PG&E Holdco Group: AMY CATON, ESQ.
9 (Telephonically)
10 Kramer Levin Naftalis & Frankel
11 LLP
12 1177 Avenue of the Americas
13 New York, NY 10036
14 (212) 715-7772
15
16 For Group of Creditors: MARK E. FELGER, ESQ.
17 (Telephonically)
18 Cozen O'Connor
19 1201 North Market Street
20 Suite 1001
21 Wilmington, DE 19801
22 (302) 295-2087
23
24 For the Ad Hoc Committee THOMAS A. REGAN, ESQ.
25 of Holders of Unsecured (Telephonically)
26 Trade Claims: Cozen O'Connor
27 501 West Broadway
28 Suite 1610
29 San Diego, CA 92101
30 (619) 685-1757
31
32 For the Ad Hoc Committee DAVID M. FELDMAN, ESQ.
33 of Holders of Unsecured (Telephonically)
34 Trade Claims: MATTHEW K. KELSEY, ESQ.
35 (Telephonically)
36 200 Park Avenue
37 New York, NY 10166
38 (212) 351-4000
39
40 For the Ad Hoc Committee MATTHEW D. MCGILL, ESQ.
41 of Holders of Unsecured Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher LLP
42 Trade Claims: 1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
43 Washington, DC 20036
44 (202) 955-8500

1 For the Official Committee DAVID J. RICHARDSON, ESQ.
2 of Tort Claimants: Baker & Hostetler LLP
3 11601 Wilshire Boulevard
4 Suite 1400
5 Los Angeles, CA 90025
6 (310) 442-8858
7
8 CECILY A. DUMAS, ESQ.
9 Baker & Hostetler LLP
10 600 Montgomery Street
11 Suite 3100
12 San Francisco, CA 94111
13 (415) 659-2600
14
15 For the Ad Hoc Group of MATTHEW A. FELDMAN, ESQ.
16 Subrogation Claim Holders: (Telephonically)
17 Willkie Farr & Gallagher LLP
18 787 Seventh Avenue
19 New York, NY 10019
20 (212) 728-8651
21
22 For Plaintiffs Aceves, et BRENDAN M. KUNKLE, ESQ.
23 al.: (Telephonically)
24 Abbey, Weitznerberg, Warren & Emery
25 PC
 100 Stony Point Road
 Suite 200
 Santa Rosa, CA 95401
 (707) 542-5050
 REBECCA J. WINTHROP, ESQ.
 Norton Rose Fulbright US LLP
 555 South Flower Street
 41st Floor
 Los Angeles, CA 90071
 (213) 892-9200
 SANDEEP QUSBA, ESQ.
 (Telephonically)
 MICHAEL H. TORKIN, ESQ.
 (Telephonically)
 Simpson Thacher & Bartlett LLP
 425 Lexington Avenue
 New York, NY 10017
 (212) 455-2000

1 For California State PAUL J. PASCUZZI, ESQ.
2 Agencies: Felderstein Fitzgerald Willoughby
3 Pascuzzi & Rios LLP
4 500 Capitol Mall
5 Suite 2250
6 Sacramento, CA 95814
7 (916) 329-7400
8
9 For Calpine: AMENEH BORDI, ESQ.
10 (Telephonically)
11 Kirkland & Ellis LLP
12 601 Lexington Avenue
13 New York, NY 10022
14 (212) 909 3264
15
16 For Creditor Agajanian: SEAN T. HIGGINS, ESQ.
17 (Telephonically)
18 Andrews & Thornton, Attorneys at
19 Law, A Law Corporation
20 4701 Von Karman Avenue
21 Suite 300
22 Newport Beach, CA 92660
23 (800) 664-1734
24
25 For CPUC: BRIAN S. HERMANN, ESQ.
26 (Telephonically)
27 ALAN W. KORNBERG, ESQ.
28 (Telephonically)
29 Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton &
30 Garrison LLP
31 1285 Avenue of the Americas
32 New York, NY 10019
33 (212) 373-3000
34
35 For Ghost Ship Plaintiffs' ESTELA O. PINO, ESQ.
36 Ex. Committee: (Telephonically)
37 Pino & Associates
38 1520 Eureka Road
39 Suite 101
40 Roseville, CA 95661
41 (916) 641-2288
42
43 For International W. STEVEN BRYANT, ESQ.
44 Brotherhood of Electrical (Telephonically)
45 Workers Local Union 1245: Locke Lord LLP
46 600 Congress Avenue
47 Suite 2200
48 Austin, TX 78701
49 512-305-4726

1 For JPMorgan Chase: EREZ E. GILAD, ESQ.
2 (Telephonically)
3 KRISTOPHER M. HANSEN, ESQ.
4 (Telephonically)
5 SHERRY J. MILLMAN, ESQ.
6 (Telephonically)
7 Stroock & Stroock & Lavan LLP
8 180 Maiden Lane
9 New York, NY 10038
6 (212) 826-8853
7
8 FRANK A. MEROLA, ESQ.
9 (Telephonically)
10 Stroock & Stroock & Lavan LLP
11 2029 Century Park East
12 Los Angeles, CA 90067
13 (310) 556-5959
14
15 For Liberty Mutual KEVIN D. BUSH, ESQ.
16 Insurance: (Telephonically)
17 Cozen O'Connor
18 501 West Broadway
19 Suite 1610
20 San Diego, CA 92101
21 (619) 685-1716
22
23 For Public Employees MICHAEL S. ETKIN, ESQ.
24 Retirement Association of ANDREW BEHLMANN, ESQ.
25 New Mexico: Lowenstein Sandler LLP
One Lowenstein Drive
Roseland, NJ 07068
(973) 597-2500
26
27 RANDY MICHELSON, ESQ.
28 Michaelson Law Group
29 220 Montgomery Street
30 Suite 2100
31 San Francisco, CA 94104
32 (415) 512-8600
33
34 CAROL C. VILLEGRAS, ESQ.
35 JEFFREY A. DUBBIN, ESQ.
36 NICOLE ZEISS, ESQ.
37 Labaton Sucharow LLP
38 140 Broadway
39 New York, NY 10005
40 (212) 907-0700

1 For Public Entity Impacted
2 by the Wildfire: CLIFF I. TAYLOR, ESQ.
3 (Telephonically)
4 Stutzman, Bromberg, Esserman &
5 Plifka
6 2323 Bryan Street PAUL R. GLASSMAN, ESQ.
7 Suite 2200 (Telephonically)
8 Dallas, TX 75201 Stradling, Yocca, Carlson & Rauth,
9 (214) 969-4990 P.C.
10 For South San Joaquin 100 Wilshire Boulevard
11 Irrigation District: Fourth Floor
12 PAUL R. GLASSMAN, ESQ. Santa Monica, CA 90401
13 (Telephonically) (424) 214-7021
14 For Southern Power HARRIS B. WINSBERG, ESQ.
15 Company: (Telephonically)
16 Troutman Sanders LLP 600 Peachtree Street NE
17 Suite 3000 Atlanta, GA 30308
18 (404) 885-3348
19 For State Farm: ALLAN S. BRILLIANT, ESQ.
20 (Telephonically)
21 Dechert LLP Three Bryant Park
22 1095 Avenue of the Americas
23 New York, NY 10036
24 (212) 698-3600
25 For Travelers Ins. Co. and A. SCOTT LOEWE, ESQ.
Hartford Ins. Co.: (Telephonically)
Bauman Loewe Witt & Maxwell, PLLC
8765 East Bell Road
Suite 210
Scottsdale, AZ 85260
(480) 502-4664
PETER D. WOLFSON, ESQ.
(Telephonically)
Dentons US LLP
1221 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10020
(212) 768-6840

1 For TURN: ROBERT G. HARRIS, ESQ.
2 (Telephonically)
3 Binder & Malter LLP
4 2775 Park Avenue
Santa Clara, CA 95050
(408) 295-1700

5 For the United States of MATTHEW J. TROY, ESQ.
America: (Telephonically)
6 United States Department of
7 Justice
Ben Franklin Station
P.O. Box 875
Washington, DC 20044
(202) 514-9038

8
9 ALSO PRESENT: WILLIAM B. ABRAMS, Pro Se
10 ADAM GOLDBERG (Telephonically),
Trident DMG
11 BENJAMIN SCHRAG (Telephonically),
Prime Clerk
12 SAMUEL STARR (Telephonically), FTI
Consulting
13
14
15
16
17 Court Recorder: ANKEY THOMAS
18 United States Bankruptcy
Court
19 450 Golden Gate Ave.
San Francisco, CA 94102
20
21 Transcriber: CLARA RUBIN
eScribers, LLC
22 7227 N. 16th Street
Suite #207
23 Phoenix, AZ 85020
(973) 406-2250
24
25 Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording;
transcript provided by transcription service.

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA, WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 29, 2020,

2 10:00 AM

3 -00-

4 (Call to order of the Court.)

5 THE COURT: Good morning, everyone.

6 IN UNISON: Good morning, Your Honor.

7 THE COURT: Please be seated.

8 THE CLERK: The PG&E Corporation.

9 THE COURT: Mr. Karotkin, good morning. If you're
10 okay, I'm going to take the Rule 7023 motion and then deal with
11 the Chapter 11 status matter. Is that okay with you?

12 MR. KAROTKIN: Yes, sir, whatever --

13 THE COURT: Anything else on your agenda for this
14 morning?

15 MR. KAROTKIN: I don't believe so.

16 THE COURT: Okay. All right, well, let's proceed. I
17 gave you the docket text on the Rule 7023 motion, so who's got
18 the watch? Who's got the duty?

19 Good morning.

20 MR. ETKIN: Good morning, Your Honor. Michael Etkin,
21 Lowenstein Sandler, on behalf of the Public Employees
22 Retirement System of New Mexico.

23 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Etkin.

24 MR. ETKIN: If I can just take a moment to introduce
25 my colleagues who are --

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 THE COURT: Sure.

2 MR. ETKIN: -- here today.

3 THE COURT: Please.

4 MR. ETKIN: My partner, Andrew Behlmann --

5 THE COURT: Good morning.

6 MR. ETKIN: -- Randy Michelson, our --

7 THE COURT: I know Ms. Michelson.

8 MR. ETKIN: -- California counsel.

9 MS. MICHAELSON: Good morning, Your Honor.

10 MR. ETKIN: And from the Labaton law firm, which is
11 lead counsel in the underlying class action, we have Carol
12 Villegas --

13 THE COURT: Good morning.

14 MR. ETKIN: -- Nicole Zeiss --

15 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good morning, Your Honor.

16 MR. ETKIN: -- and Jeff Dubbin.

17 THE COURT: Thank you for coming to court.

18 MR. DUBBIN: Good morning, Your Honor.

19 THE COURT: You all have seats? There's a couple
20 seats on the side if you -- folks coming in late or --

21 MR. ETKIN: We'll try to squeeze in --

22 THE COURT: Okay, so --

23 MR. ETKIN: -- somewhere, Your Honor.

24 THE COURT: -- you've got my docket order about
25 timing?

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 MR. ETKIN: I do. And --

2 THE COURT: Okay.

3 MR. ETKIN: -- again, preliminarily, Your Honor, my
4 colleague, Mr. Behlmann, and I are going to split the argument,
5 and Mr. Behlmann's going to handle the notice issue and I'll
6 handle everything else. We've talked about trying to reserve
7 ten minutes --

8 THE COURT: Okay.

9 MR. ETKIN: -- for rebuttal, but --

10 THE COURT: Well, my --

11 MR. ETKIN: -- lawyers and timing is always
12 aspirational, Your Honor.

13 THE COURT: You know, we're running parallel with the
14 United States Senate this morning at this exact moment, but I
15 don't have the rigid timetable that the chief justice does.

16 MR. ETKIN: That's --

17 THE COURT: But I do have a couple of preliminary
18 questions, so -- again, I don't think you've been here before,
19 but I'm a notorious questioner.

20 MR. ETKIN: Oh, no, I've --

21 THE COURT: Can you imagine presiding over fifty
22 senators and they can't talk?

23 MR. ETKIN: I had a tough-enough time representing a
24 group of lawyers who couldn't agree whether it was day or
25 night, so --

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 THE COURT: My question is rather obvious, I think.
2 You made the point in your papers and in response, particularly
3 to the TCC: this is not about the nondebtor defendants; your
4 claims here that you're asserting and talking about are only
5 against the corporate debtors. And I guess -- does it really
6 matter whether they are derivative or direct? Either way,
7 510(b) disposes of them in a sense; isn't that right?

8 MR. ETKIN: Well, I think, as long as those are claims
9 in connection with the purchase or sale of a security, --

10 THE COURT: But isn't that what this is --

11 MR. ETKIN: -- 510(b) disposes of it. And that's what
12 our claims are.

13 THE COURT: Well, that's right. So --

14 MR. ETKIN: So we have conceded that 510(b) --

15 THE COURT: Right, but what I'm getting at --

16 MR. ETKIN: -- applies to our claims.

17 THE COURT: -- is I went and read in the papers your
18 dispute that I think is a nondispute for today's purposes,
19 about claims against the nondebtor officers and directors.
20 Whether those are direct or directive is for another day or
21 another court; it's not relevant to today.

22 MR. ETKIN: Absolutely correct, Your Honor. I think
23 that's --

24 THE COURT: And so do I care or do you care whether
25 the members of the class that you want to represent actively

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 here assert derivative claims or direct claims against the
2 corporate debtors? Does it matter?

3 MR. ETKIN: Well, it only matters to the extent that,
4 if we're asserting derivative claims, that brings into play
5 another issue that's not before the Court.

6 THE COURT: Right.

7 MR. ETKIN: The other point is that, if they were
8 derivative claims against the debtor, that means the debtor
9 would own the claims against itself. So by --

10 THE COURT: Well, I understand, but isn't that the
11 nature of all derivative claims?

12 MR. ETKIN: Correct, Your Honor --

13 THE COURT: Yeah.

14 MR. ETKIN: -- but these are -- the claims asserted
15 against the debtor in the proofs of claim are securities-fraud
16 claims. But for purposes of today, I don't know that it
17 matters. But certainly we dispute the fact that our claims
18 against the debtors are derivative claims as well.

19 THE COURT: It seems to me angels on a pin, unless I'm
20 missing something, because you acknowledge that the 510(b)
21 operates and therefore the fire survivors are not impacted by
22 this. The only people that are impacted, I guess, on an
23 adverse outcome, not on today's motion but on the merits, are
24 the equity holders.

25 MR. ETKIN: That's correct, Your Honor --

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 THE COURT: Okay. Okay. I mean, without --

2 MR. ETKIN: -- because that's where our claims fall.

3 THE COURT: -- without getting into the nuances of
4 what kind of equity holders and securities -- I mean equity
5 versus debt, I don't care about that today.

6 So here's my next question: A lot is spent -- a lot
7 of time is spent on the debtors' side, about the notice and the
8 class -- the class notice and the supplemental notices. If an
9 individual -- let's say Mr. A -- Mr. A held equity in the
10 parent company all the way through the record date and the
11 petition date and was therefore given notice. Isn't that
12 person going to be -- that Individual A, isn't he affected by
13 the consequences if he hasn't filed a timely claim?

14 In other words -- let me state it more specifically.
15 Do you speak here today on behalf of every single person who
16 might have been defrauded in the four years that we're talking
17 about, or only those who didn't have the proper notice and
18 therefore could have, or either did or didn't, file proofs of
19 claim? That's what I -- because that's what I'm a little
20 unclear on. And --

21 MR. ETKIN: I understand the question.

22 THE COURT: And that gets to proof of claim or proof
23 of interest, because proofs of interest didn't have to be
24 filed. And the notice says you don't have to file a proof of
25 interest but, if you have a claim, you have to -- you have to

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 do so.

2 MR. ETKIN: Correct. Well, that begs the question of
3 whether a particular current holder or a holder on the record
4 date understood that distinction and even knew that they had a
5 claim.

6 THE COURT: Well, Mr. A on my hypothetical got the
7 notice anyway. Whether he knew what to do about it we'll leave
8 for another day.

9 MR. ETKIN: Correct.

10 THE COURT: My question is do you speak for Mr. A
11 today?

12 MR. ETKIN: We speak for all putative class members,
13 Your Honor, whether they're current holders or not.

14 THE COURT: And whether they got actual notice or not?

15 MR. ETKIN: And whether they got actual notice or not.

16 THE COURT: Okay, the next question --

17 MR. ETKIN: Mr. Behlmann'll get into that issue in a
18 little more detail --

19 THE COURT: Okay, well, all right.

20 MR. ETKIN: -- but --

21 THE COURT: And the last question on that subject is
22 what do we do if this gets to the class situation and A has
23 filed a claim? What happens in a class-action matter of this
24 nature in the bankruptcy court when a member of the class filed
25 a claim? Because, obviously --

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 MR. ETKIN: What --

2 THE COURT: -- unless -- I didn't go look at the
3 claims docket.

4 MR. ETKIN: Right.

5 THE COURT: Maybe you did. But I suspect some people
6 did.

7 MR. ETKIN: We didn't look at the claims docket, nor
8 does anybody indicate how many of those types of claims were
9 actually filed, if any, other than our client.

10 But here's what happens: If the class is ultimately
11 certified --

12 THE COURT: Right.

13 MR. ETKIN: -- and there's a claim that is either
14 resolved by settlement or litigation, class members, under Rule
15 23 incorporated into Rule 7023, have the option to opt out if
16 they want.

17 THE COURT: Well, as they do in all class -- most
18 class actions.

19 MR. ETKIN: Correct.

20 THE COURT: But most class actions aren't in
21 bankruptcy with claims bar dates.

22 MR. ETKIN: That's correct. So if somebody did file,
23 how that's been handled in -- I've been involved in a lot of
24 these over the years, and how it's been handled in the past is
25 the individual claim is deemed duplicative of the class claim,

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 and the distribution process with respect to a classwide
2 distribution, to the extent there's anything to distribute at
3 the end of the day, would take precedence over that, unless
4 that individual decided to opt out of the class and pursue its
5 own claim. Frankly, from the standpoint of reality, Your
6 Honor, that would be highly unlikely.

7 THE COURT: Okay. And I realize that I'm a little bit
8 ahead of myself, too. You're here today to tell me that I
9 should permit the class claim and, if I answer that question in
10 the affirmative, then at some other day we'll deal with the
11 more traditional Rule 23 matters. But --

12 MR. ETKIN: As well as the merits.

13 THE COURT: But they stay in this court, right?

14 MR. ETKIN: They stay in this court, Your Honor.

15 THE COURT: Because it's a proof-of-claim issue.

16 MR. ETKIN: That's --

17 THE COURT: Okay.

18 MR. ETKIN: That's exactly right. I mean, in all
19 candor, and based upon some of the things Your Honor has done
20 already in this case, it may make more practical sense to have
21 one court deal with the class-certification issue. But again,
22 all of that is for another day.

23 THE COURT: You know, I'm going to get a reputation
24 among the district judges if I keep trying to shift stuff off
25 on them.

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 MR. ETKIN: No -- I think it's just the practical
2 approach --

3 THE COURT: Okay.

4 MR. ETKIN: -- that Your Honor takes.

5 THE COURT: Those are my preliminary questions. So
6 why don't you go ahead and use the time as you wish on your
7 argument. I have read the briefs. I am familiar with the
8 issues. But you're up.

9 MR. ETKIN: Okay. Thank you, Your Honor. Your Honor,
10 what the parties do agree about is that there are three primary
11 factors considered by the courts that have addressed the
12 threshold question of whether to apply Rule 7023 --

13 THE COURT: Right.

14 MR. ETKIN: -- to a timely-filed class proof of claim,
15 whether the class was certified pre-petition, the propriety of
16 the notice provided to the class members, and the impact on the
17 administration of the estate.

18 THE COURT: You can save some of your remaining time.
19 I got issue 1. I mean, it's --

20 MR. ETKIN: Right.

21 THE COURT: If in my discretion there should have been
22 something done that were done and my discretion is to say
23 that's not a fatal flaw by it not having happened, there's
24 nothing else to talk about.

25 MR. ETKIN: I didn't intend to go into the pre-

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 petition class-cert issue too much; I think that's covered by
2 the papers.

3 I think the debtors and the TCC adhere to an overly
4 rigid analysis, Your Honor, of these factors, without
5 consideration of the facts and circumstances here. Frankly,
6 Your Honor, the arguments advanced by the TCC and the debtors
7 would effectively neutralize the very purpose of Rule 7023 that
8 is obviously in the books for a reason.

9 While the debtors appear to analyze these factors
10 somewhat in a vacuum along with the TCC, they ignore the
11 admonition in the case law, including the Musicland case, which
12 is cited often by both the debtors and the TCC, that the weight
13 of each of these three factors must be determined on a case-by-
14 case basis, that no one factor is dispositive, and any factor
15 may become more or less important, depending on the facts of
16 the case. And we submit, Your Honor, that whether this class
17 was certified pre-petition or not is a nonfactor, especially
18 since the operative complaint was filed post-petition in the
19 district court. And that was pursuant to a stipulation with
20 the debtors and others, that was so-ordered by this Court, in
21 terms of the timing of the filing of the third --

22 THE COURT: Okay, actually I realize that --

23 MR. ETKIN: -- amended complaint.

24 THE COURT: -- there was another question that's maybe
25 not related exactly. And if you want to pass it to Mr.

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 Behlmann, you can. But forgive me for forgetting one of my
2 hypotheticals. We talked about Mr. A who might file a claim.
3 Now I want to talk about Mr. B, Mr. B who did not get anything.
4 Mr. B sold his -- bought his stock in 2016, sold it in 2018,
5 and never got on anybody's service list. If I deny the motion
6 today, is Mr. B out of luck?

7 MR. ETKIN: Correct.

8 THE COURT: Completely?

9 MR. ETKIN: Well, unless this Court adopts the
10 reasoning of the MF Global case and the Connaught case in New
11 York, where those courts took the position that the American
12 Pipe -- the Supreme Court case, American Pipe -- the tolling
13 that exists in class actions, where individual claims are
14 tolled for statute-of-limitations purposes, if the class is not
15 certified --

16 THE COURT: Well, but I'm not -- but not even not
17 certified. If the motion to file the claim is denied --

18 MR. ETKIN: That's correct.

19 THE COURT: -- and again, assuming it's not appealed,
20 Mr. B is out of luck, I guess, unless, as a matter of due
21 process, his claim would pass through. 1141 says confirmation
22 and discharge is everything, but the case law has said due
23 process still means something.

24 MR. ETKIN: That's correct, Your Honor.

25 THE COURT: So --

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 MR. ETKIN: That's correct.

2 THE COURT: -- what happens to Mr. B in my
3 hypothetical if he never got --

4 MR. ETKIN: Well, there are two --

5 THE COURT: -- notice of anything?

6 MR. ETKIN: Likely he is -- as well as thousands of
7 others, would be out of luck. The exception is, number one, if
8 there was a ruling that -- like in those cases I mentioned,
9 that American Pipe applies and you need to give these absent
10 class members, where certification was not ordered by this
11 Court, an opportunity to come in and file their own claim
12 again --

13 THE COURT: Okay.

14 MR. ETKIN: -- or if that individual class member
15 decided to come in and say that the discharge is not applicable
16 because they never got notice -- constitutionally appropriate
17 notice of the bar date.

18 THE COURT: Well, that might invite a new class action
19 on behalf of everybody who didn't get any notice at all, which
20 is sort of a subset of what you're here for today. I mean,
21 aren't you --

22 MR. ETKIN: Yeah, I think about -- I think about that,
23 Your Honor, and, frankly, my head comes closer to exploding. I
24 don't know what would happen or what could happen down the
25 road.

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 THE COURT: Well, but this case is unlike the cases
2 where notice is never given because there's no way the person
3 could have even known that a claim existed. This is not like
4 the abuse cases or the latent toxic-tort cases. This is -- the
5 allegations are that something was misstated during a four-year
6 period before bankruptcy, and the facts are, as alleged, some
7 people bought securities during that period, and some stayed on
8 and still held them, and some got rid of them. And the
9 question is, in that second category -- we're back to the point
10 that I'm struggling with and what happens to those people.

11 MR. ETKIN: I think they're potentially
12 disenfranchised, Your Honor --

13 THE COURT: Okay.

14 MR. ETKIN: -- if they don't have an opportunity for
15 representation through the class-claim process.

16 Your Honor, the debtors and the TCC seem to also
17 believe that the timing of the filing of the 7023 motion here
18 and the fact that lead plaintiff did not object to the bar-date
19 motion are fatal to the application of Rule 7023. And again,
20 when the facts and context are taken into consideration, as
21 well as the relevant case law set forth in our motion and the
22 reply, those arguments don't impact the necessary conclusion
23 that the class mechanism embodied in the Bankruptcy Rules is
24 appropriate and essentially, really -- and the Court just
25 touched upon it -- to preserve the opportunity for thousands of

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 defrauded investors to have their claims against the debtor
2 resolved on the merits.

3 THE COURT: Well, aren't we back to my poor Mr. B?
4 Mr. B doesn't even know that there's a hearing on whether
5 there's going to be a bar date, so I can hardly say he should
6 have come and objected to the bar date, if he didn't know about
7 the thing in the first place.

8 MR. ETKIN: We're back to your poor Mr. B.

9 THE COURT: Right?

10 MR. ETKIN: That's correct, Your Honor.

11 THE COURT: Okay.

12 MR. ETKIN: And in our papers there's an indication --
13 and Mr. Behlmann'll touch on it as well -- as to the amount of
14 shares that traded in the nine-month period between the end of
15 the class period set forth in the class-action complaint and
16 the class proof of claim, and the record date, which was
17 utilized for purposes of determining holders. Billions of
18 shares were traded. So --

19 THE COURT: No; I understand.

20 MR. ETKIN: -- the idea that notifying holders
21 notified the entire class of purchasers during the class period
22 is just, frankly, an absurd notion.

23 Your Honor, I'd like to talk briefly about the timing
24 of the Rule 7023 motion, to the extent the Court believes that
25 filing less than two months after the bar date was not undue

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 delay. It's really a function, Your Honor, of whether granting
2 the relief requested will negatively impact the administration
3 of this case. And we maintain, it clearly won't here.

4 This is not Musicland or its progeny, the Fedra (ph.)
5 case in the Southern District, where a disclosure statement was
6 approved, votes on the plan were being or had been solicited.
7 And indeed, in Musicland the confirmation hearing had already
8 started. Nor has the prospect of a class claim by defrauded
9 investors come out of the woodwork. The debtors were very much
10 on top of it by filing the adversary proceeding that they filed
11 two weeks after the petition date.

12 There are no compelling circumstances here mandating
13 denial of the motion based upon the timing of its filing. The
14 class claim itself was timely filed. The debtors were
15 defendants in the securities litigation pre-petition. The
16 securities-litigation claims, Your Honor, are even classified
17 in every iteration of the plan that's been filed before this
18 Court; yes, as 510(b) subordinated claims, a classification
19 that we don't dispute. And the treatment afforded those claims
20 as subordinated claims appear (sic) in the waterfall
21 anticipated by at least the currently filed plan.

22 THE COURT: Well, not -- I mean, 510(b), AB 1054, the
23 whole dynamic, leaves no choice. I mean, as I say, there's no
24 way, as I see it, that your constituents can do anything other
25 than be in that position, no better than their fellow

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company
1 securities claimants.

2 MR. ETKIN: That is -- that's absolutely correct, Your
3 Honor.

4 THE COURT: Okay.

5 MR. ETKIN: And frankly, in ninety-nine percent of the
6 cases --

7 THE COURT: It's --

8 MR. ETKIN: -- equity is out of the money altogether.

9 THE COURT: I know.

10 MR. ETKIN: So I wouldn't be standing up and talking
11 to you about this. It would be irrelevant.

12 THE COURT: You wouldn't even be here.

13 MR. ETKIN: Well, I might be here on the 105
14 injunction, and I might be here on the plan, but I certainly
15 wouldn't be here on this.

16 The debtors concede, really, that there's much more
17 work to be done in advance of confirmation. And even Musicland
18 states that delay, assuming it even exists here, does not
19 automatically disqualify a class proof of claim.

20 THE COURT: Well, hold on. Again, if I were to grant
21 your motion, is there any reason why we have to do anything in
22 any kind of a fast track for the next phase of the Rule 23
23 matter? Would seem to me, all these other things that are
24 driven by AB 1054 and the need to take care of the survivors,
25 and all the obvious things -- it would seem to me your folks

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 could easily be back-of-the-line for priority purposes, in
2 terms of dealing with --

3 MR. ETKIN: Well, we are back-of-the-line for --

4 THE COURT: Well, I know, but I mean --

5 MR. ETKIN: -- priority purposes.

6 THE COURT: -- in terms of -- in terms of motions
7 and --

8 MR. ETKIN: Right.

9 THE COURT: -- determinations. I understand your --

10 MR. ETKIN: What does that -- being back-of-the-line
11 for priority purposes, what does that translate into, Your
12 Honor?

13 THE COURT: I meant for scheduling purposes.

14 MR. ETKIN: It translates into: there's no rush.

15 THE COURT: Right.

16 MR. ETKIN: And we make a point that, number one,
17 certification, pure Rule 23 certification, of securities cases
18 is not complicated, to begin with. And number two, to the
19 extent the claim needs to get resolved through litigation, that
20 can easily await confirmation and happen after confirmation of
21 the --

22 THE COURT: And then --

23 MR. ETKIN: -- of the plan.

24 THE COURT: And then whether it's in this court or
25 some other court, there will be a -- if there is no settlement,

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 it'll be a determination: either recovery or no recovery.

2 MR. ETKIN: That's right.

3 THE COURT: I mean, plaintiffs do lose class actions
4 sometimes; right?

5 MR. ETKIN: It does happen.

6 THE COURT: Okay.

7 MR. ETKIN: It does happen. In fact, there's what we
8 talked about during the argument on the 105 injunction. The
9 motions to dismiss have been fully briefed, and oral argument
10 is scheduled for February 6th.

11 THE COURT: Well, I understand, but those are
12 different. I mean, do you think, if Judge Davila grants those
13 motions to dismiss, that moots the case here?

14 MR. ETKIN: I think that it will have an impact on
15 the --

16 THE COURT: It might affect people's motivation,
17 but --

18 MR. ETKIN: I think it will have an impact.

19 THE COURT: Okay.

20 MR. ETKIN: I'm not going to conjecture on the actual
21 impact, but --

22 THE COURT: You don't need to.

23 MR. ETKIN: -- it will certainly have an impact.

24 In fact, Your Honor, granting this threshold motion
25 with respect to the application of Rule 7023, from our

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 perspective, is not only appropriate and necessary; it also can
2 provide an impetus for discussions. I mean, the debtor has
3 managed to talk to most of the constituency. We're not
4 claiming our constituency is more significant or less
5 significant, but I think the debtor has made that
6 determination, and that's fine.

7 But there is the possibility -- and even Mr.
8 Tsekerides, during the course of oral argument on the 105
9 motion, mentioned several times that securities cases --

10 THE COURT: I know.

11 MR. ETKIN: -- ultimately are either (sic) mediated --

12 THE COURT: I know they do.

13 MR. ETKIN: -- and settled.

14 THE COURT: And we might be able to accommodate them
15 too.

16 Anyway, you want to reserve some time for Mr. --

17 MR. ETKIN: I do, Your Honor. I just want to go over
18 a couple more things.

19 THE COURT: Okay.

20 MR. ETKIN: I don't know how much time I have left.

21 THE COURT: He's your colleague. Well, you're cutting
22 into --

23 MR. ETKIN: He's my -- and I don't want him to scream
24 at me.

25 But one thing about impact on the estate, Your Honor,

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 and the Musicland -- the impact on the administration of the
2 estate and the Musicland case, which I think is important, is,
3 when you dive into Musicland a little bit, you understand what
4 was at stake. The class action there was in connection with
5 claims that would be either priority or administrative claims.
6 The Musicland plan, which was up for confirmation, and
7 confirmation had actually started, had a cap on administrative
8 and priority claims.

9 So allowing 7023 at that very late stage of the case
10 would have put feasibility --

11 THE COURT: Right. Right.

12 MR. ETKIN: -- of that plan --

13 THE COURT: No. I understand.

14 MR. ETKIN: -- into question. So that's gumming up
15 the works, Your Honor; this isn't, as we've discussed.

16 THE COURT: Well, I might use that phrase, though.
17 It's a good phrase to hang onto --

18 MR. ETKIN: I know. I know. And --

19 THE COURT: -- "gumming up the works".

20 MR. ETKIN: And that's what Judge Bernstein said. And
21 interestingly enough, in his -- in Judge Bernstein's Connaught
22 opinion, which was decided several years later, he actually
23 utilized the American Pipe holding for the proposition that, if
24 a class wasn't certified in that case, individual class members
25 should still have the opportunity to file claims because of the

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 tolling in a class-action context. Certification -- granting
2 of this motion will deal with that issue. And it was elegantly
3 dealt with by Judge Glenn in MF Global, and it's an elegant
4 solution to the prospect of having to re-notice or deal with
5 all of that. That's basically what the class-action mechanism
6 is all about.

7 Your Honor, we talked about, in our papers, the
8 fundamental distinctions between the Alonzo motion, which the
9 Court --

10 THE COURT: Yeah, I --

11 MR. ETKIN: -- denied for a tentative.

12 THE COURT: You don't have to explain that. I know
13 the --

14 MR. ETKIN: And I'm not going to --

15 THE COURT: I mean --

16 MR. ETKIN: -- get into that.

17 THE COURT: If the other side wants to convince me
18 that I should stick -- be consistent, they can do so. But I
19 find the factual predicate in Alonzo --

20 MR. ETKIN: And --

21 THE COURT: -- are (sic) quite different.

22 MR. ETKIN: -- I'm not going to get into TCC's
23 separate argument about whether the claims against the
24 directors and officers are derivative or direct claims.

25 THE COURT: They don't need to. I mean --

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 MR. ETKIN: That's for another day. And to the extent
2 we feel we have to deal with that in the few minutes of
3 rebuttal we have, that's fine.

4 THE COURT: Okay.

5 MR. ETKIN: So I'm getting back -- so getting back to
6 the fundamental question we ask in our reply, which is, is the
7 class-claim mechanism superior to the proof-of-claim process
8 with respect to this class -- putative class of defrauded
9 investors under the circumstances of these Chapter 11 cases, I
10 think the answer is yes.

11 Your Honor, it should be noted that class members,
12 during the class period -- if you look at the average price of
13 PG&E stock during the class period, which we did in Bloomberg,
14 the average price was fifty-five dollars per share. So at the
15 end of the day, there was a loss. Whether on the merits the
16 class claims are sustained in this court or in the district
17 court is another question. But they paid, on the average,
18 fifty-five dollars a share. They need an opportunity to be
19 able to vet those claims, despite the fact that they're
20 subordinated claims and the recovery at this point is unknown.

21 THE COURT: Okay.

22 MR. ETKIN: And with that, I'll yield to Mr. Behlmann.

23 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Etkin.

24 MR. ETKIN: Thank you.

25 THE COURT: Well, I think you have five to ten

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 minutes. I mean, again, I'm not going to be precise on the
2 time, but --

3 MR. BEHLMANN: Understood. Thank you, Your Honor.

4 THE COURT: Yeah.

5 MR. BEHLMANN: And I will endeavor to keep my remarks
6 brief, and --

7 THE COURT: Okay, Mr. Behlmann.

8 MR. BEHLMANN: -- I will speak quickly but not so
9 quickly that the court reporter cannot understand.

10 THE COURT: It's all done electronically. The court
11 reporter is a computer.

12 MR. BEHLMANN: Your Honor, you and the --

13 THE COURT: If she got -- if that one doesn't
14 understand you, I can't help you.

15 MR. BEHLMANN: Well, either way, I'll speak as quickly
16 and clearly as possible, Your Honor.

17 Your Honor, you and Mr. Etkin had some colloquy about
18 Mr. A and Mr. B and what notice that Mr. A and Mr. B may have
19 gotten or not gotten. I think it might be helpful to talk
20 about what notice Mr. A and Mr. B were actually entitled to
21 get. There's a fair amount of ink spilled in all of the
22 parties' papers on this issue, but I think it would be helpful
23 to crystallize some of that as we're here today. So the --

24 THE COURT: Well, in my hypothetical, Mr. A got a
25 notice -- there's no question about that, right -- because, in

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 my hypothetical, A is still on board as an equity holder.

2 MR. BEHLMANN: Understood.

3 THE COURT: And he happened to receive it and he knew
4 about it. But we'll talk about what notice Mr. B in
5 particular, as an absent class member, who's truly absent, not
6 a holder, was actually entitled to get, because --

7 THE COURT: Again, so we're --

8 MR. BEHLMANN: -- I think --

9 THE COURT: -- so we're on the same page, I regard Mr.
10 B as somebody who bought his shares during the window and sold
11 them. Whether he bought public debt or public equity is not
12 relevant. He bought them in 2016, sold them in 2018, and was
13 off on a Hawaiian cruise when he learned of the bankruptcy in
14 January of 2019. Okay?

15 MR. BEHLMANN: A true absent class member, Your Honor.

16 THE COURT: Okay. Okay.

17 MR. BEHLMANN: With respect to Mr. B, the operative
18 question is, was Mr. B a, quote, "known creditor" of the
19 debtors? Was he a party that they reasonably should have been
20 able to identify and provide actual notice of the bar date to?
21 If the answer to that is yes, then there's two things that we
22 know to be true and that I don't think the parties necessarily
23 dispute would be true; one is that Mr. B would be entitled, as
24 a matter of constitutional due process, to actual notice of the
25 bar date. If he was a known creditor under the rubric

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 established in pretty much every case to address the issue
2 since Mullane, he was entitled to actual notice.

3 The debtors admit, in their papers and in the various
4 certifications, they did not provide actual notice to the Mr.
5 Bs of the world. They try to rely on publication notice and
6 assert that that was good enough. We'll talk about why that
7 wasn't good enough, in a little bit.

8 The debtors go to pretty great lengths to describe the
9 actual notice they did provide. They did provide notice to
10 lots of other people.

11 THE COURT: Yeah.

12 MR. BEHLMANN: I think there's talk of six-and-a-half
13 million mailed notices. The problem is, most of those 6.2
14 million, as we see in the Schrag declaration, were mailed to
15 customers. Little under a quarter million went to fire
16 claimants, scheduled creditors, vendors, and subrogation
17 claimants. A hundred and eleven thousand went to the Mr. As of
18 the world: the current holders of the debtors' equity
19 securities as of one specific point in time: the record date
20 of July 1st. But nowhere in that list do we see purchasers of
21 the debtors' securities during the class period. The Mr. Bs of
22 the world are just sort of left as though they're not --
23 they're not known, they couldn't be known, they're not entitled
24 to actual notice, in the debtors' view.

25 THE COURT: Well, they -- again, let's break down to

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 simple terms.

2 MR. BEHLMANN: Sure.

3 THE COURT: And let's pretend Mr. B is an equity
4 holder. I guess corporate entities should know who, at some
5 point in the past, was a shareholder. Maybe he doesn't know
6 when that person is no longer a shareholder.

7 MR. BEHLMANN: That is --

8 THE COURT: Right?

9 MR. BEHLMANN: That is absolutely correct and
10 absolutely --

11 THE COURT: Okay.

12 MR. BEHLMANN: -- our position, Your Honor. And I'll
13 explain why in about thirty seconds.

14 The second thing that's true, if they were known
15 creditors, if it was possible for the debtors, as Your Honor
16 just asked, to identify those folks, was publication notice in
17 any quantity good as to them? If the debtors, instead of
18 essentially dropping leaflets on the entire Northern
19 California -- if they had blanketed the country in publication
20 notice, would that ever be good enough? As a matter of law,
21 the answer is no, that's never good enough. And we'll talk
22 about why in a moment.

23 The touchstone for determining whether these folks --
24 whether the Mr. Bs of the world were known creditors is whether
25 they were reasonably ascertainable; could the debtors have done

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 something to reach them, and is that "something" reasonable.

2 Yes. There are customary procedures that are used in every
3 securities class action. So in any securities class-action
4 case in the country --

5 THE COURT: You've established a basis for it.

6 MR. BEHLMANN: Yep. -- there is a set of procedures
7 that are used. And parties, lead plaintiffs in those cases,
8 for instance, when there are settlements -- if a settlement
9 contains a bar order or some other provision that's going to
10 bind people, before district courts can bind those people, they
11 send out notice.

12 THE COURT: Well, are you suggesting that the people
13 who are making the decisions on how to send out the bar-date
14 notice should have known what these established securities
15 procedures were, because of the pendency of the action in the
16 district court? I mean, it wasn't something like -- nothing
17 was pending here.

18 MR. BEHLMANN: Well, that's part of it, Your Honor.

19 THE COURT: Right? So, I mean, where would they go to
20 look to see the "good book" that says how we're supposed to do
21 it in this case?

22 MR. BEHLMANN: That's a perfect question, Your Honor,
23 and a wonderful segue. There are firms that specialize in
24 that. The debtors happened to use one of those firms --

25 THE COURT: Right.

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 MR. BEHLMANN: -- in this case: Heffler.

2 THE COURT: Yeah.

3 MR. BEHLMANN: Heffler specializes in sending notice
4 to securities class members. There's another firm. We
5 submitted the Walter declaration.

6 THE COURT: No, no, but I understand that.

7 MR. BEHLMANN: Yeah.

8 THE COURT: I read those papers.

9 MR. BEHLMANN: Sure.

10 THE COURT: But what about -- this actual case was a
11 bankruptcy and there was, of course, a pending district-court
12 action. Are you saying that Heffler and the company's
13 decision-makers should have put that together, said, because
14 this action is pending against the officers and directors and,
15 I guess, originally the company, they should have followed, in
16 bankruptcy-notice rules, the procedures that might have been
17 applied if there never had been a bankruptcy?

18 In other words, I think -- to state it differently,
19 what you're telling me is all this authority for, and precedent
20 for, what happens outside of bankruptcy. But this is inside a
21 bankruptcy. So what were the bankruptcy people supposed to do
22 to know -- to import the U.S. District Court federal securities
23 class-action procedures?

24 MR. BEHLMANN: It's like you're reading ahead in my
25 notes, Your Honor.

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 The answer is yes. I'm saying that they should have
2 known that they should have used those procedures, because they
3 were aware the class action existed. They took steps at the
4 very outset of the case. As Mr. Etkin noted, two weeks into
5 the bankruptcy, the debtors filed an adversary proceeding
6 seeking to put the entire securities class action on hold
7 against all of the other defendants. So they knew that they
8 were out there; they knew --

9 THE COURT: Well, but remember --

10 MR. BEHLMANN: -- the claims were out there.

11 THE COURT: -- they were trying to get a stay for
12 those people who weren't automatically protected by the stay.

13 MR. BEHLMANN: Understood, but the --

14 THE COURT: So --

15 MR. BEHLMANN: -- the debtors were defendants in that
16 case. The debtors were defendants in the securities class
17 action at that time.

18 THE COURT: And I guess nominally still are, but still
19 protected by the stay.

20 MR. BEHLMANN: Correct. So there is no way for the
21 debtors to stand before Your Honor and say, "Your Honor, we had
22 no idea these people had claims."

23 THE COURT: Well, I'll try it a different way. Is
24 there any guidance in the authorities or the literature or the
25 expertise in the class-action world, of importing procedures to

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 use in class actions at a time when the very defendant is
2 protected by the stay? In other words, what -- if I go to the
3 "good book" on how to serve properly in securities litigation,
4 is there a subsection on "this applies even when you're
5 protected by the automatic stay"?

6 MR. BEHLMANN: It is rare, Your Honor, and I will tell
7 you why it's rare. It's rare for the exact reason Mr. Etkin
8 mentioned a little while ago, which is, typically a securities-
9 fraud claimant has a claim that's subordinated under Section
10 510(b) with respect to their claim against the debtor.

11 THE COURT: Correct.

12 MR. BEHLMANN: Typically, equity, in the average
13 Chapter 11 case of a publicly traded company, is anticipated to
14 be out of the money. So debtors do not typically serve, in a
15 case where equity is anticipated to be out of the money, and
16 usually well out of the money, bar-date notices on those folks.

17 THE COURT: Right.

18 MR. BEHLMANN: But here, from the --

19 THE COURT: I agree. I mean --

20 MR. BEHLMANN: -- from the --

21 THE COURT: -- I've done it on little cases, but
22 public companies that are insolvent from day one.

23 MR. BEHLMANN: Sure. And from the outset of this
24 case, it was clear to presumably everybody in the room that
25 equity was very likely to be in the money, which means the

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 debtors knew, or at least should have known -- and presumably
2 they did know, because they classified and treated the 510(b)
3 claims in the plan --

4 THE COURT: Well, I don't think you can start to fault
5 what was being done earlier in the case and what shows up in a
6 plan later. I mean, they didn't file a plan on the petition
7 date that showed we had a 10(b) (sic) --

8 MR. BEHLMANN: No, but at the -- fair point. But from
9 the very outset of the case, the stock was still trading --

10 THE COURT: Well, that --

11 MR. BEHLMANN: -- in the double digits.

12 THE COURT: I agree with you. I mean, look, we had
13 discussions from the very outset, and the premise, to this day,
14 has been solvency. Everything's been premised on that, and
15 hopefully it's still a legitimate premise.

16 MR. BEHLMANN: Sure. So to build on that, Your Honor,
17 from our standpoint, the debtors knew that there were claims
18 out there that had been asserted against them. These weren't
19 just inchoate hypothetical claims. These were claims that had
20 been asserted against the debtors in a complaint -- actually,
21 in several complaints filed in the district court.

22 So the debtors knew the claims existed. They knew the
23 scope of the class period that was asserted against them. All
24 they had to do was take the exact same procedures they used, to
25 give notice of the bar date to current holders as of the July 1

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 record date and apply those procedures to the class period.
2 That is the procedure that is used and that their consultant
3 Heffler actually touts on their website, as we mentioned in our
4 reply brief; hey, this is how we do it. They talk about cases
5 where they gave notice to tens, or even hundreds of thousands,
6 of prospective class members, under these exact same
7 circumstances; not in bankruptcy, but publicly traded
8 shareholders that had to be given actual notice of something.
9 In those cases, I believe they were settlements in the class
10 action. But here it's -- from a due-process standpoint, the
11 reality is no different.

12 THE COURT: Do you have any other cases that are
13 equivalent to this one, public debtor, class action,
14 bankruptcy, solvency, a given? Do we have a counterpart in
15 other bankruptcies that --

16 MR. BEHLMANN: Very few that I can recall, Your Honor.
17 And frankly, in the few that I've dealt with, we've actually
18 reached a consensual resolution of this issue and allowed class
19 claims on a stipulated basis --

20 THE COURT: Well --

21 MR. BEHLMANN: -- after a motion like this.

22 THE COURT: Maybe that'll happen here; right?

23 MR. BEHLMANN: Which may happen here.

24 THE COURT: But -- no, but I'm not making light of the
25 problem on both sides. But I'm going back to what could

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 somebody on the other side have done to go to the book, to go
2 to the -- where do I look to see what's been done in other
3 clearly solvent public companies in bankruptcy, with a class
4 action pending against officers and directors down the street?

5 MR. BEHLMANN: There's --

6 THE COURT: I don't remember if we had a class action
7 in the bankruptcy -- well, PG&E number I. Maybe we did. I
8 don't remember.

9 MR. BEHLMANN: And frankly, Your Honor, there's not a
10 lot of precedent on that, for the reason --

11 THE COURT: Okay.

12 MR. BEHLMANN: -- I mentioned before. But that
13 doesn't mean that the procedures don't exist. That doesn't
14 mean that the debtors, in conjunction with their advisors who
15 specialize in giving actual notice to members of securities
16 class actions -- that they're simply excused from their
17 obligation to provide due-process notice. Those due-process
18 obligations still exist.

19 The debtors attempt to explain away in their papers,
20 well, we may not have had any guarantee that the nominees would
21 have forwarded the notices on. But they didn't have that
22 guarantee with respect to the current holders. They gave them
23 notice anyway. The --

24 THE COURT: Well, we're back to Mullane, "reasonable
25 under the circumstances"; right? Your point is --

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 MR. BEHLMANN: Sure.

2 THE COURT: -- it's not -- they didn't pass that
3 reasonable-minimum test that, given -- had they done what you
4 think Heffler could have done, maybe that would be different.
5 Right?

6 MR. BEHLMANN: Yeah. Absolutely. I mean --

7 THE COURT: And maybe Mr. B would be out of luck
8 because he was on the cruise in the South Seas and didn't get
9 whatever attempt to give him notice that could have been done.

10 MR. BEHLMANN: Absolutely. And frankly --

11 THE COURT: Okay.

12 MR. BEHLMANN: -- they didn't do anything with respect
13 to the Mr. Bs of the world. Either -- we could stand here and
14 speculate as to why that is, whether they didn't think about
15 the Mr. Bs, they didn't -- they just didn't follow the
16 procedure from every other publicly traded case that's out --
17 where equity is out of the money. I don't know why they did
18 it. But the reality is, as we stand here today, there are
19 tens, or even hundreds of thousands, of class members that
20 didn't receive notice of the bar date that we assert they were
21 entitled to, because there was a reasonable procedure that the
22 debtors even refer to as ordinary and customary --

23 THE COURT: Okay.

24 MR. BEHLMANN: -- for reaching out and getting mail in
25 the hands of these folks.

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 THE COURT: Do you want to -- again, I told you I'm
2 not going to hold you exactly to the time, but I want to let
3 you reserve some time also with your colleagues. So unless
4 there's something really critical, maybe we'd be better off
5 letting you come back in final. Is that all right, or do you
6 want to make --

7 MR. BEHLMANN: That's all right. I could spend --

8 THE COURT: I mean, I --

9 MR. BEHLMANN: -- thirty seconds --

10 THE COURT: -- I promise you, I've read the briefs.
11 Okay, go ahead and do a --

12 MR. BEHLMANN: There's one point I wanted to spend
13 thirty seconds highlighting, Your Honor, and then I will --

14 THE COURT: Okay.

15 MR. BEHLMANN: -- I will step down and cede the podium
16 to the debtors, and that is, the point that I made at the very
17 outset of this discussion, which is that publication notice was
18 not good enough. The Ninth Circuit has referred to actual
19 notice as a, quote, "minimum constitutional precondition to a
20 proceeding which will ... affect the liberty or property
21 interests of" a creditor in bankruptcy.

22 The Ninth Circuit has also held that the burden is on
23 the debtor to cause actual notice to be given to known
24 creditors. And if they don't, even if that known creditor has
25 notice of the reorganization proceedings -- so somebody

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 actually learns about PG&E's bankruptcy, they happen to see one
2 of the publication notices the debtors targeted at fire
3 victims -- that person -- the onus is not on him to run into
4 the bankruptcy case and file --

5 THE COURT: So somebody who lives --

6 MR. BEHLMANN: -- a proof of claim.

7 THE COURT: -- in San Francisco or, better yet, lives
8 in Santa Rosa or in Paradise, if they weren't -- if they didn't
9 get the notice as an equity holder -- or former equity holder,
10 the fact that they knew of the bankruptcy -- well, that's a bad
11 example, I mean, because of the attempts to let the people from
12 Paradise and the other fire areas know the extent of notice.
13 But somebody who is even local, if that person wasn't served
14 with the actual notice, the notion that everybody in Northern
15 California knows that PG&E's in bankruptcy is not enough.

16 MR. BEHLMANN: Correct.

17 THE COURT: Okay.

18 MR. BEHLMANN: From a constitutional due-process
19 standpoint, that's not good enough, Your Honor.

20 THE COURT: Okay.

21 MR. BEHLMANN: Thank you.

22 THE COURT: Okay. So we'll reserve ten minutes for
23 your side.

24 Mr. Slack, right? Are you going to make the argument?

25 MR. SLACK: Yes, I am, Your Honor.

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 THE COURT: Are you going to share that with someone
2 on the other side, with TCC? Do you have a sharing arrangement
3 with --

4 MR. SLACK: Yes. Mr. Richardson is going to --

5 THE COURT: Okay.

6 MR. SLACK: -- is going to argue for the TCC, and --

7 THE COURT: Okay.

8 MR. SLACK: -- we're going to split it thirty and ten,
9 Your Honor.

10 THE COURT: Thank you. Good morning, Mr. Slack.

11 MR. SLACK: Good morning, Your Honor. Richard Slack
12 for the debtors.

13 And I'd like to accept your invitation to start with
14 the Alonzo case --

15 THE COURT: Okay.

16 MR. SLACK: -- and tell you why there's no daylight
17 between the situation here and in Alonzo.

18 So, Your Honor, in Alonzo, plaintiff there was a
19 terminated employee who sought to bring a proof of claim on
20 behalf of a class of former employees, from June of 2016
21 forward. Like here, Alonzo did not have a class certified pre-
22 petition and, indeed, his pre-petition certification was
23 theoretically impossible under the same terms that the
24 plaintiffs suggest, because his complaint was not filed until
25 shortly before or just after the petition date.

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 The 7023 motion was made in October. That's two
2 months before the movants here filed. And the debtors in that
3 case had served notice on employees prior to the petition date,
4 back to January 1, 2017, meaning that there was a six-month
5 period in the Alonzo matter, Your Honor, where the debtors
6 relied on constructive notice. And as you recall, Mr. Alonzo,
7 made the exact same argument in his papers that the PERA
8 movants do here, is that his class did not get -- entirely get
9 actual notice.

10 Now, the movants don't deal with Alonzo at all until
11 the last paragraph on the last page. And they only make one
12 argument as to why they say it's different, in that paragraph.
13 And they say it's different because -- they say that the
14 debtors admitted that every absent class member got actual
15 notice.

16 THE COURT: Well --

17 MR. SLACK: And they cite to our papers when they make
18 (sic) that. And they say -- here, reading from their papers,
19 "The facts are to the contrary, and the debtors" -- this is our
20 papers, what we say -- "the debtors sent a claims package to
21 every current employee, including Mr. Alonzo. In addition, the
22 debtors sent the claims package to every former employee, not
23 just the subset of former employees who might be members of the
24 putative class", and they have ellipsis, ellipsis, ellipsis.

25 And if you look at what they take out, Your Honor, it

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 changes the entire meaning, because what it says, that they
2 ellipsis out, is -- and reading it fully, it says, "not just a
3 subset of former employees who might be members of the putative
4 class, but every single one whose termination date occurred
5 between January 1, 2017 and January 28, 2019." And the next
6 paragraph goes on to say that therefore six months' of people
7 in the class did not get actual notice and were relying on
8 constructive notice in order to satisfy the Musicland factor.

9 So --

10 THE COURT: Does the fact that -- well, first of all,
11 you'll recall that there never was a ruling on the merits, see.
12 Mr. Alonzo accepted a tentative ruling, and the tentative
13 ruling, in part, was based upon that he himself had a post-
14 petition claim. So he was out of the money to begin with, from
15 my point of view. But also, even if Mr. Alonzo had asserted a
16 claim, it wouldn't have been 510(b)-related. Does that make a
17 difference or not?

18 MR. SLACK: No, it doesn't make a difference for the
19 Musicland factors, in the sense that, if anything, Your Honor,
20 not having a 510(b) claim there is irrelevant here because it's
21 a 510(b) claim. And as we'll get to when we talk about the
22 administration of the estate, this Court is going to have to
23 decide -- if you certify this class, it's going to have to
24 decide in some way or another what the value is, because we
25 have equity holders who are --

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 THE COURT: No, I --

2 MR. SLACK: -- both taking equity as part of the
3 financing, as well as they're voting. And they're going to
4 need to know how much they're diluted by a huge class seeking
5 literally billions of dollars in damages, even if it is reduced
6 on a 510(b) level.

7 So the fact here --

8 THE COURT: Well, it's not reduced. It's
9 subordinated.

10 MR. SLACK: Well, subordinated.

11 THE COURT: But it's subordinated --

12 MR. SLACK: But it's subordinated to equity, so it'll
13 be pari passu with the equity --

14 THE COURT: It'll be pari passu with --

15 MR. SLACK: -- and you'll have to know --

16 THE COURT: Okay.

17 MR. SLACK: -- you'll have to know in terms of what
18 that dilution factor is and how --

19 THE COURT: No, I fully understand there is a dilution
20 factor.

21 MR. SLACK: And the point is, Your Honor, you're going
22 to have to deal with that in the next five months --

23 THE COURT: Well --

24 MR. SLACK: -- if you certify this class.

25 THE COURT: Well --

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 MR. SLACK: So what we would say, Your Honor, though,
2 is that whether Alonzo was a tentative, what Your Honor said in
3 the tentative, and we agree with it a hundred percent, is the
4 persuasive arguments of debtors re: robust noticing, absence of
5 pre-petition class certification, and lateness in filing the
6 motion well after the bar-date notice, alone, justify denial.
7 We agree with that then. We agree with that now.

8 THE COURT: Well, just looking at it from my point of
9 view here, is there not a difference between somebody who very
10 recently was an employee and someone who years ago was a
11 shareholder or bondholder? You think --

12 MR. SLACK: Well --

13 THE COURT: You think there's no difference there?

14 MR. SLACK: The difference cuts the other way from
15 what the PERA-motion plaintiffs would like you to believe,
16 because, if anything, those employees -- you could have
17 theoretically gone into the company records and --

18 THE COURT: Right.

19 MR. SLACK: In the situation of the securities
20 plaintiffs, the whole idea there is that the debtor, in its
21 books and records, doesn't have the names of the beneficial
22 owners.

23 THE COURT: Correct.

24 MR. SLACK: Here's what it has: --

25 THE COURT: Correct.

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 MR. SLACK: -- it has the record holders, which were
2 served, and those don't change very much, and then nominees are
3 like the banks of the world --

4 THE COURT: No, I know. I know how that --

5 MR. SLACK: -- and then you have --

6 THE COURT: I know how that works.

7 MR. SLACK: -- the beneficial owners.

8 THE COURT: And nobody can guarantee in absolute
9 certainty that, through the nominee, through the third -- the
10 intermediate levels, the person will actually get notice. That
11 gets back to reasonable likelihood of making it. But to me
12 it's a whole different ballgame to think about somebody that
13 six months earlier was an employee of the company.

14 MR. SLACK: Well, again, I would tell Your Honor that
15 it actually cuts --

16 THE COURT: I mean, they weren't --

17 MR. RICHARDSON: -- it actually --

18 THE COURT: -- they weren't nominee employees.

19 MR. SLACK: It actually cuts against the PERA
20 plaintiffs here --

21 THE COURT: Okay.

22 MR. SLACK: -- because the idea and the question --
23 and it's the heart of it -- is whether the beneficial owners
24 are known. And if you look at the Chemetron case, which is the
25 case they cite and we cite, what it says is you predominantly

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 look at what information is in the debtors' books and records.
2 Okay? And in the debtors' books and records, we do not have
3 the nominees, and -- I'm sorry, we have the nominees; we do not
4 have -- and we don't have a full list of the nominees, but what
5 we --

6 THE COURT: No, but you know who the major players in
7 the world are. For nominees --

8 MR. SLACK: And we sent -- and we --

9 THE COURT: -- the --

10 MR. SLACK: And we sent out -- and it's in Ms. Pullo's
11 declaration, that we sent notice to all of the record holders
12 and all the nominees.

13 So the only issue, Your Honor, is whether the absent
14 class members are known to the debtors. And what I would
15 suggest, Your Honor, is that, if you look at their own
16 declaration, I think that Mr. Walter's declaration, in
17 paragraph 9 -- he starts talking about how, in order for the
18 debtors to get the information, we should come to you as part
19 of the bar-date order and get an order telling the nominees to
20 tell us who these people are. To the extent somebody has to go
21 and get an order to get the information, it's pretty clear that
22 these people are not known to the debtors. And --

23 THE COURT: But isn't that standard procedure in the
24 world -- in the financial world of people owning through street
25 accounts?

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 MR. SLACK: And --

2 THE COURT: I mean, if I have ten shares of ABC
3 company at Charles Schwab as the broker in town, that's my
4 nominee. I'm not hiding money. I'm just buying ten shares
5 through Schwab. And if you want to serve me constructively,
6 you at least have to notify Schwab, right?

7 MR. SLACK: So that is exactly right, Your Honor. You
8 said something which I want to -- I want to put in headlights.
9 That notice that we would give you as a nominee -- as a
10 beneficial holder beyond the nominees, is itself constructive
11 notice. It is a form, as you said, of constructive notice,
12 because we send out the information to the nominees and then it
13 gets distributed. So all we're really talking about is another
14 form of constructive notice.

15 THE COURT: Well, you send a notice to Charles Schwab
16 and it says, if you have any clients that own stock in XYZ,
17 please -- or maybe you don't say "please" --

18 MR. SLACK: Yep.

19 THE COURT: -- forward these on. And so all of us --
20 anybody in this room who own stock through that way maybe get
21 something now and then from your stockbroker that --

22 MR. SLACK: Right.

23 THE COURT: -- you got some notice or something.

24 So --

25 MR. SLACK: And the issue, Your Honor --

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 THE COURT: Right?

2 MR. SLACK: -- is whether that is -- whether those
3 holders are known, not whether there's a mechanism at some
4 point that'll get to most of them maybe. The point is whether
5 they're known.

6 And you asked a great question, and let me give you
7 the direct answer. You asked are there any cases that address
8 this in the securities context in bankruptcy.

9 THE COURT: Right.

10 MR. SLACK: And the answer is yes. And the answer is
11 they go against the PERA plaintiffs.

12 So if you look at the GAC case that we cite in our
13 papers, and you look at pages 16 to 17, the Eleventh Circuit
14 dealt with this specifically and says that you do not need to
15 give actual notice to absent securities holders. And it said
16 that, under those circumstances -- it says the court concluded,
17 under the circumstances of the case, the publication notice was
18 reasonably calculated to apprise nonholding debenture
19 purchasers of the necessary (sic) to file -- of the necessity
20 to file individual proofs of claim, and the notice thus
21 complied with the requirements of due process.

22 The other case that the PERA plaintiffs site is not to
23 the contrary, and that's the Amdura case. And what's
24 interesting about Amdura, Your Honor, is there you had a class
25 pre-certified. And so what the court there said, since there

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 was a pre-certified class, to the extent that the plaintiffs
2 had information, the debtors should get it from the plaintiffs.
3 And then it says something interesting in that case: everybody
4 else can get constructive notice. Everybody else. So the one
5 case that they rely on also says constructive notice is okay to
6 get to absent shareholders.

7 So there are two cases, Your Honor, that deal with
8 this issue in the bankruptcy context, and both go against PERA.

9 Now, Your Honor --

10 THE COURT: So you say Mr. B was on his cruise; he's
11 out of luck because there was an attempt through the
12 constructive-notice process, through his brokerage account, or
13 wherever, to give him notice. Mr. A got notice and he has a
14 right to file a claim, or not?

15 MR. SLACK: So I think, Your Honor, that Mr. A has
16 notice and can file a claim. Mr. B also had notice,
17 constructive notice.

18 THE COURT: Well, yeah.

19 MR. SLACK: We all know, Your Honor --

20 THE COURT: I mean, that's what you're saying:
21 constructive --

22 MR. SLACK: -- that in bankruptcy, there are people
23 who get constructive notice. And even though we have here a
24 program of constructive notice that went far beyond -- and
25 nationwide, far beyond --

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 THE COURT: Well, I know you do but, again, the
2 argument on the other side is that you're dealing with the
3 fires and the aspect of the fire, and there isn't -- it's a
4 different extent of notice. But there're difference of
5 opinions about that.

6 What's your take on the question of -- in my going
7 back to my A and B, if I deny today's motion, B is out of luck;
8 right?

9 MR. SLACK: So I would say two things, Your Honor.
10 Number one, you say "out of luck".

11 THE COURT: Well --

12 MR. SLACK: B could do two different things at this
13 point: One, B could make a motion, that he specifically could
14 say, "I was on a cruise for three months, and I shouldn't be
15 expected to see constructive notice," even though the cruise
16 probably had The Wall Street Journal and People and New York
17 Times and everything else that he needs, because people get the
18 internet now. Used to be, I think, thirty years ago --

19 THE COURT: Well, he's sailing his own boat, that is,
20 and he doesn't have internet access.

21 MR. SLACK: So, Your Honor, if somebody says, "Look, I
22 was on a" -- "I was on an African safari for three months,"
23 maybe the debtor's not going to object to that proof of claim
24 coming in. But the fact is that constructive notice is
25 constitutionally sufficient.

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 And let me say one other thing, Your Honor, which is
2 really important for this hearing. And we've talked about this
3 over and over, and I've heard my colleague, Mr. Karotkin, say
4 this to Your Honor, and I think it rings true here. There is
5 no evidence -- evidence -- before Your Honor that there is
6 anybody who did not receive notice, whether actual or
7 constructive. So in front of Your Honor, there is no evidence
8 put on my PERA that anybody actually didn't receive notice
9 here. That is a fundamental flaw of their argument.

10 Now, a couple of things, Your Honor, that I still want
11 to -- I still want to get to, and I have a little time,
12 luckily.

13 THE COURT: Well, excuse me. I mean, is it really a
14 flaw procedurally? In other words, if the statement is made
15 that, except the -- in my hypothetical, except people who were
16 on the distribution list and actually got notice, that those
17 people -- since there was no coordinated attempt to send out
18 actual notice through the way we talked about Mr. B, does it
19 make a difference that I don't have a declaration from someone
20 that says, "I was on a cruise and I didn't get notice"? I
21 mean, it seems to me that goes to something later on, but not
22 for today's purposes.

23 MR. SLACK: Well, I guess I would say, Your Honor, is
24 (sic) you would be throwing out both the test in Musicland if
25 you did that -- because the test in Musicland, when you get to

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 notice, is important in that Musicland says, right in its test,
2 it's a matter of actual and constructive notice.

3 So Your Honor can't just say, well, because we didn't
4 send out a piece of paper -- I talked to many people, and we
5 actually had some argument and testimony from the TCC in
6 connection with the bar-date-extension motion, where they said
7 people got actual notice and threw it out. And it's actually
8 seeing it on TV and the publication that actually makes a
9 difference. And that was the argument that was made. So the
10 fact that you get a combination here of actual and constructive
11 notice is actually required and is part of the test that you
12 get in Musicland.

13 And, Your Honor, let me just say, we talked about the
14 Alonzo case and the precedent, but the position of PERA cannot
15 be reconciled; not just they don't have any cases that address
16 this, but it can't be reconciled with other precedent.

17 So let me talk about two cases. In the Bally case,
18 the bankruptcy court denied a motion for class treatment, and
19 the decision was appealed. And that's in the Southern
20 District. It's in our paper. So the plaintiffs there were,
21 again, an employment class, where the company had the records
22 of the employees. And the proposed-class period was December
23 2001 to December 2008, a seven-year period. The notice here
24 was given from 2004 forward. So there were three full years of
25 people who only received constructive notice through

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 publication.

2 The district court, Judge Rakoff, affirmed the lower
3 court. And here's what Judge Rakoff said: "[I]t is undisputed
4 that Bally mailed notice of the Bar Date by first-class mail to
5 all current and former employees employed at any time after
6 January 1, 2004. While a much smaller part of the putative
7 class, namely, those ... Bally employees whose employment ended
8 between December 30, 2001 and January ... 2004, received ...
9 notice by publication, this was still legally adequate."

10 There's the Blockbuster case, Your Honor, also cited
11 in our papers, at 441 B.R. 239. And in Blockbuster, the
12 bankruptcy court held exactly the same as Bally. What happened
13 there was the debtors provided adequate notice to members of
14 the class by publishing notice of the case and the bar date, in
15 three papers: the Dallas Morning News, The New York Times, and
16 The Wall Street Journal.

17 Your Honor, those cases cannot be reconciled with the
18 position that PERA is taking here.

19 Now, we've gone through the notice and the robustness
20 of the notice, but what I think is important, Your Honor, is
21 that the constructive notice here -- and if you remember the
22 bar-date motion with --

23 THE COURT: Of course.

24 MR. SLACK: -- the TCC objecting, it was not just
25 about what the words on the notice said. The TCC had come

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 forward with a whole implementation plan to Your Honor. There
2 were (sic) hearing after hearing about it.

3 THE COURT: No, there was. But --

4 MR. SLACK: There were -- and the point, Your Honor,
5 and I just want to make it, is that there were changes that
6 were made to make that noticing even more robust in terms of
7 going out to the internet, having impressions. And that's all
8 in our declarations, Your Honor.

9 So now you have to ask yourself, Your Honor, isn't
10 that the right time -- if there were issues by the
11 representatives here of the securities class, let's measure
12 what happened at the bar date with the other representatives
13 that we had. The TCC represented fire victims. They came
14 forward, as I just said -- we had hearings on the
15 implementation. If --

16 THE COURT: Yeah, but --

17 MR. SLACK: -- they thought there were problems --

18 THE COURT: I mean, we --

19 MR. SLACK: -- with the implementation --

20 THE COURT: This case wouldn't be here if it weren't
21 for the fires. And from the very moment this case was filed,
22 the focus has been on what has to be done about the fire
23 victims and notice. And remember what the debtors' original
24 claim form looked like. I mean, we're not talking about just
25 the simple question of the kind of notice that the plaintiffs

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 here are talking about. We're talking about the fundamental
2 way that the survivors of the fires are going to be treated,
3 broadly.

4 So I think it's just -- you're pushing on the wrong
5 unopened door, on trying to say it's the same. You may
6 persuade me to deny their motion for the reasons that you've
7 said, but I don't -- I just can't think about all the
8 discussions and all the efforts by survivors, their lawyers,
9 the committees, your side, me, everybody else, on what's the
10 right thing to do to give the proper notice to those --

11 MR. SLACK: Yeah. Well, let --

12 THE COURT: -- classes; thousands of people.

13 MR. SLACK: Understood, Your Honor. And that makes
14 sense. But what I will say is, in a matter where PERA is
15 suggesting that you have discretion -- and you do -- I think
16 it's important to ask the question why weren't these
17 plaintiffs, who were involved in the case -- if you remember --

18 THE COURT: Well, aren't you --

19 MR. SLACK: -- back in March --

20 THE COURT: But you're really blaming the class-action
21 lawyers, that maybe they could have done it. They're blaming
22 your side for not doing the right thing through the brokerage
23 houses. You're blaming them for, well, they should have come
24 up in the middle of a hearing about how to take care of fire
25 survivors, let's take care of investors who had their stock

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 values go down. They're just not the same. It's just not the
2 same emphasis. And we wouldn't --

3 MR. SLACK: But if this --

4 THE COURT: -- we wouldn't be here in this discussion
5 if it weren't for the fires.

6 MR. SLACK: No, and --

7 THE COURT: And so --

8 MR. SLACK: -- look, Your Honor, as I said, it's a
9 discretionary factor. We think you should take that into
10 account.

11 THE COURT: Okay.

12 MR. SLACK: I understand that's up to you, whether you
13 do or don't.

14 But let me get to the last point, which is the
15 administration of the estate, Your Honor. PERA makes no
16 attempt to distinguish, again, your preliminary ruling in
17 Alonzo that Alonzo was too late to make this motion and filed
18 it two months before. And when you look at the standard of
19 Musicland -- and again, we've talked about the standard sum --
20 what does Musicland say? Musicland says timing is also
21 significant. The most propitious time for filing a motion for
22 class recognition is before a bar date is established, before
23 it's established, since the bar date is effectively uprooted,
24 in part, by the extension of the bar date for a favored class
25 of creditors. And Your Honor recognized that in Alonzo.

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 And now when you get to this case, let's look at where
2 we are in this case. PERA waited until December 2019 to bring
3 this motion; two months after Alonzo. And the Court itself has
4 recognized, and I don't think I have to go into this that in
5 its January 15th, 2020 order that we got five months; that's
6 it. Five months.

7 THE COURT: Well, I was just reminding you, but you
8 knew it anyway.

9 MR. SLACK: Right?

10 THE COURT: That's right.

11 MR. SLACK: So Your Honor --

12 THE COURT: But you --

13 MR. SLACK: -- let's look --

14 THE COURT: But you got to persuade me that you're
15 right and they're wrong about there really isn't so much time.
16 Do you really think that before this plan can become effective
17 we have to quantify what should be reserved for this -- the
18 510(b) parties?

19 MR. SLACK: So what I think, Your Honor, is that these
20 claims, which again if they get their way they're going to
21 assert that these are -- these claims are worth billions of
22 dollars. So --

23 THE COURT: Well, I know; they might.

24 MR. SLACK: When we're talking about equity, we're
25 talking about --

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 THE COURT: We can also estimate them too.

2 MR. SLACK: But when you're talking about -- we have
3 two sets of claims, and I want to be clear here too -- you've
4 also got potentially, again, probably less so, but at least
5 hundreds of millions of claims by noteholders all of whom
6 almost certainly, by the way, got notice here, right. But --

7 THE COURT: Well, we have noteholders and equity
8 holders.

9 MR. SLACK: Right.

10 THE COURT: The world is divided into those two
11 categories --

12 MR. SLACK: Right.

13 THE COURT: -- that these counsel want to represent.

14 MR. SLACK: So the point is, Your Honor, is that if
15 you're going to have a dilution factor for the equity, there's
16 two things that are happening, right. There's going to be a
17 vote of the equity -- equity has to vote -- and they're going
18 to need to know what their return is in order to vote on it.

19 And so --

20 THE COURT: But Mr. Slack we have ways to temporarily
21 allow for voting, and we have ways to estimate allowances
22 for -- this is not a 170 --

23 MR. SLACK: You're right. So let's --

24 THE COURT: This is not -- I'm not sending this one to
25 Judge Donato to estimate.

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 MR. SLACK: Let's take the timing here.

2 THE COURT: I can estimate it.

3 MR. SLACK: Let's take the timing here, right.

4 THE COURT: Okay.

5 MR. SLACK: So we have five months. What they did
6 here was they didn't bring the second part of the motion, which
7 is really required, and you could deny it on its own, and that
8 is the Rule 23 factors --

9 THE COURT: I know, but that's -- there's arguments
10 both ways on that.

11 MR. SLACK: But let's say -- let's assume now we're
12 going to have to go and do that. That's, at least -- and
13 there's typically discovery -- that's at least a month or two.
14 And then, you have to give notice to the class. If you look at
15 all -- the cases that have denied these, like the Bally (ph.)
16 case, they say that okay, here's what you have to do. You have
17 to have a Rule 23 in discovery; that takes a couple of months.
18 Then you have to give notice to the class because here's one of
19 the things, Your Honor, that certainly is potential.

20 The people who filed proofs of claim, they may not
21 want to share their legal fees with PERA -- the PERA lawyers.
22 They may want every dollar of what they're entitled to,
23 whatever it is, and they may not want to be subject to the
24 legal fees of the class-action lawyers. So you're going to
25 have to give notice to the class.

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 Then third, Your Honor, we're already out two, three
2 months, minimum. We've now got only a couple of months to
3 figure out whether we're going to value these.

4 Now, if you're talking about a securities claim,
5 you're going to have to have discovery, you're going to have to
6 have a proceeding of some kind. And again, I think whether it
7 gets addressed in an estimation, whether it gets addressed as
8 part of valuation or feasibility, I think all that needs to be
9 figured out, but what I could tell you what's going to need to
10 be figured out, and just like you said in Alonzo (ph.), it's
11 too late and timing is a huge issue here.

12 THE COURT: But again, the reason why I don't want to
13 get too hung up on Alonzo is Alonzo was nothing more than a
14 tentative ruling. I never had it vetted in terms of argument.
15 We didn't have this kind of argument. And Mr. Alonzo, I will
16 repeat, was tainted from day one because he had a post-petition
17 claim. So I might not have said that as clearly as I might
18 have a tentative ruling, but it was just plain so. Right?

19 MR. SLACK: So --

20 THE COURT: Right? Wasn't that true? Am I
21 remembering it correctly?

22 MR. SLACK: Your Honor, when you issue a tentative
23 ruling, I pay attention to it.

24 THE COURT: Well, no, didn't I observe that he had a
25 post-petition claim? So --

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 MR. SLACK: He did, but --

2 THE COURT: -- could not be representative of the
3 class.

4 MR. SLACK: Yes. What you observed though, Your
5 Honor -- and again, we pay attention to what you write -- is
6 that the lack of a pre-petition certification, the constructive
7 and robust notice and the lateness in and of itself justified
8 denial. So we only can go by Your Honor's words, but as I
9 said, what Your Honor wrote was absolutely consistent with the
10 precedent in Bally and Blockbuster and a number of the other
11 cases that we cite in our papers.

12 THE COURT: Well, I won't tell I went and studied them
13 all, but okay, let's -- well, I want you ask you another
14 question though, I want you to tell me really, do you really
15 believe that granting this motion will jeopardize the time line
16 that we're going to talk about in a little while this morning
17 and that is that five month clock that's ticking?

18 MR. SLACK: I do.

19 THE COURT: Because I don't think that's --

20 MR. SLACK: I --

21 THE COURT: I'm not convinced that that's necessary,
22 but why is that so? Why is that going to muck it up?

23 MR. SLACK: Because you're going to have to figure
24 out -- class actions sometimes last two, three years.

25 THE COURT: Right. I know they do.

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 MR. SLACK: And the fact is is that you're going to
2 have to figure out prior to the time that people vote on this
3 plan -- so not even the five months -- you're going to have to
4 tell the equity holders what they're getting. You're going to
5 have to tell the people who are funding --

6 THE COURT: What would -- if there weren't a
7 settlement in the pipeline for next week with the senior
8 bondholder group, what would the disclosure statement have said
9 about what might come out on the make whole dispute or the
10 post-petition interest one? Those are big ticket items with
11 lots of dollars attached.

12 MR. SLACK: Well, I --

13 THE COURT: What does the plan going to say about that
14 or the disclosure? Isn't it going to say it might go the other
15 way?

16 MR. SLACK: Your Honor, I guess what I would say to
17 that is -- is that I would defer to my colleagues who are here,
18 Mr. Karotkin or one of the -- somebody, Mr. Goren.

19 THE COURT: Okay.

20 MR. SLACK: But -- and I'm happy to have them get up
21 and talk to that, but what I can tell you is is that this case
22 at this late stage, people are going to want to know if you're
23 funding this and you're getting equity as part of the funding,
24 you are going to want to know whether this claim is worth
25 fifteen billion or nothing or a hundred --

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 THE COURT: And Mr. Slack what you want me to believe
2 is after all the effort that's putting in by countless people;
3 lawyers and financial people, clients that someone's going to
4 vote down the plan because there might be a dilution of equity?
5 I guess it's hard for me -- that's like saying maybe on appeal
6 the post-petition interest decision would be reversed.

7 Now, I realize that that may be is a nonissue now
8 because of what's been going on, but I guess I'm just -- I'm
9 not persuaded, but I will invite the lawyers on the other side
10 and in their closing argument to tell me why your doomsday
11 prediction should be discounted, because I -- obviously, I
12 don't want to jeopardize the timetable that we're trying to
13 reach. I made a commitment, and everybody in this case, I
14 think, has made a commitment to make sure we meet that
15 deadline.

16 So -- but I can't ignore their rights. So, I -- let's
17 not -- I don't want to turn this into a -- something it isn't.
18 Go ahead and tell me what else you want to do and then we'll
19 hear from the --

20 MR. SLACK: So, I'm going to turn it over in a second.

21 THE COURT: Okay.

22 MR. SLACK: But I'm going to say, Your Honor, that
23 it's not worth the risk.

24 The point here, Your Honor, is I can't sit here and
25 have a crystal ball and tell you that -- how people are going

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company
1 to vote. What I am going to tell you, Your Honor, is that
2 people are -- is, I think, people are going to want to know
3 what they're getting, and at this stage, that's what -- that is
4 why the Musicland factors read like they read. They said if
5 you are going to bring this class action and you want a class-
6 action treatment, bring it back a year ago at the time of the
7 bar date, that's what Musicland says; that's the time to do it;
8 do it early.

9 When you cause jeopardy and risk, this Court and the
10 debtors and the other constituents who are parties to the RSA
11 shouldn't have to bear the risk of a late filed --

12 THE COURT: Well, yeah --

13 MR. SLACK: -- 7023.

14 THE COURT: -- isn't it ironic that in PG&E 1 and in
15 the Local Rules of the Northern District, perhaps a minority
16 point of view throughout the country, the bar date is very
17 early, and in PG&E 1 we made it even earlier.

18 So in this case for obvious reasons because of the
19 fires, the bar date was pushed quite late, and then for other
20 reasons even beyond that. But if we say well, what was the
21 first -- what was the bar date in this case finally? It was
22 October 21. Their motion was two months after that. That's
23 not a huge time -- no, no, I'm sorry. Yeah, that's right.
24 Today's motion was filed two months after that bar date.

25 MR. SLACK: Right.

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 THE COURT: That's not a huge time period.

2 MR. SLACK: I mean, just to be clear, I mean what
3 Musicland says is that at the time the bar date is set, not the
4 time of the bar date --

5 THE COURT: Okay. Okay. But I mean --

6 MR. SLACK: -- which is earlier. But remember, there
7 was no -- there's nothing -- and these -- you look at the
8 cases, they say this -- there's nothing preventing folks --
9 they were in this court February, March of 2019 -- from coming
10 in at that time and making this motion, and that's what the
11 cases say.

12 And so it's not a two-month period, but even if it was
13 a two-month period, when you've only got five, a two-month
14 period sounds like --

15 THE COURT: No.

16 MR. SLACK: -- a pretty long time.

17 THE COURT: Okay. All right. Let --

18 MR. SLACK: Anyhow, Your Honor, thank you very much.

19 THE COURT: Thanks, Mr. Slack. All right.

20 Mr. Nicholson, are you here? Richardson; excuse me.
21 Wrong name. Mr. Richardson.

22 MR. RICHARDSON: Good morning, Your Honor. David
23 Richardson of Baker Hostetler for the TCC.

24 Your Honor, I planned to start immediately with the
25 relevance issue and not address Rule 23 issues, but before I

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 get to that, there is one issue that Mr. Slack just addressed
2 that I think I must address.

3 THE COURT: Okay.

4 MR. RICHARDSON: That is dilution and how it affects
5 the timing of plan confirmation proceedings, and the Musicland
6 factor that goes to the impact that allows a claim or to file
7 the claim would have on plan confirmation proceedings.

8 The TCC negotiated an RSA with the debtors that
9 provide that the fire victim trust will receive 20.9 percent of
10 the debtor's common stock. That is a major part of the
11 consideration that went into the agreement to make the deal
12 that's in the RSA.

13 There's a current understanding among our financial
14 advisors of what that stock will be worth, and the extent to
15 which it will help us pay all fire victims, but if there is to
16 be dilution of stock, allegedly in the billions of dollars, we
17 have to know before there is a disclosure statement what is the
18 value we are asking fire victims to vote for? What is the deal
19 we are asking them to vote for? Do we still have the deal we
20 believe we signed?

21 I'm sure this Court has seen the many letters coming
22 from fire victims who are complaining about stock --

23 THE COURT: Well, yes, I have seen many, but AB 1054
24 says what it says.

25 MR. RICHARDSON: It does, which means --

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 THE COURT: It doesn't --

2 MR. RICHARDSON: -- we have to know what value the
3 trust is really receiving under this plan before it can be
4 confirmed. And to do that, we have to know what these claims
5 are worth, if anything, and to what extent they would dilute
6 stock, if at all, that would be received by the trust.

7 This is not something that can be put off post-
8 confirmation. We have to know quickly what the extent of these
9 claims are.

10 THE COURT: Okay.

11 MR. RICHARDSON: As far as relevance goes, the
12 securities plaintiffs have filed an action in district court
13 against the directors and officers, the debtors, and certain
14 third parties. They're the same claims, the same misdeeds, and
15 the same damages.

16 THE COURT: But it is a fact, isn't it, that
17 practically speaking, the debtors are out of that lawsuit.
18 They're still not really in there, but they're not -- no one's
19 asked for relief from stay.

20 MR. RICHARDSON: Exactly, but by filing a proof of
21 claim here, they're taking the claim for damages from the
22 debtor and moving it here into this case. If they have a
23 direct claim, then they do have a claim for damages from the
24 debtor.

25 THE COURT: Correct.

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 MR. RICHARDSON: But if what they've actually stated
2 in that complaint, which is what I'm here to argue today, are
3 derivative claims, then the debtor is merely a nominal
4 defendant. You can't sue a debtor for damages in the debtor's
5 own derivative action.

6 THE COURT: Well, I understand, but doesn't 510(b)
7 take care of all that?

8 MR. RICHARDSON: What I'm arguing, Your Honor, is if
9 these are derivative claims, the securities plaintiffs aren't
10 even creditors of the estate. Everything the Court has heard
11 this morning is irrelevant because they weren't entitled to
12 notice, they aren't entitled to file individual proofs of
13 claim, and they're certainly not entitled to assert a class
14 proof of claim.

15 THE COURT: If they're derivative claims, yes, but
16 therefore what? Suppose there is a derivative claim that's
17 already been dealt with, and I thought the plaintiffs conceded
18 that point in their papers, and you still don't -- you still
19 think -- I mean, so let's try it a different way, Mr.
20 Richardson.

21 MR. RICHARDSON: Your Honor --

22 THE COURT: If I decree that my hypothetical Mr. B.
23 holds a derivative claim, what is the legal aspect -- the
24 consequence of that?

25 MR. RICHARDSON: The legal outcome is that he has a

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 claim on behalf of the estates to assert against directors and
2 officers and third parties.

3 THE COURT: Right.

4 MR. RICHARDSON: But does not have a claim to assert
5 on behalf of the estate against the debtors for damages.

6 The claim in this case that they are filing and
7 seeking as a class proof of claim is against the debtors.

8 THE COURT: But --

9 MR. RICHARDSON: There can be no claim against the
10 debtors for a derivative claim.

11 So even though it is technically subordinated under
12 510(b), it has no value because they cannot ask for damages
13 from the debtor. They can go after Ds and Os and the insurance
14 policies, and we'll argue in the future about whether the
15 recovery is met for the benefit of the estate.

16 THE COURT: So if it's a direct claim, then what?

17 MR. RICHARDSON: If it's a direct claim, they have a
18 claim against the debtors, among other parties, and then we
19 would be dealing with all of the Musicland factors and
20 everything else argued this morning.

21 If the Court is prepared to deny the motion based on
22 the Musicland factors which we think are enough, particularly
23 in light of the dilution issue that I've raised, the Court
24 doesn't need to reach the issue of whether these are direct or
25 derivative claims until --

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 THE COURT: No, I realize that.

2 MR. RICHARDSON: But if the --

3 THE COURT: Well --

4 MR. RICHARDSON: -- possibility exists of granting
5 this motion, the idea that these are not creditors of the
6 estate is critical.

7 THE COURT: Okay. I understand your point. Let's
8 back up.

9 So your point is that if they're derivative, there's
10 nothing to it; if they're direct there is a dilution factor
11 and, therefore, it needs to be clarified and discussed and
12 analyzed.

13 MR. RICHARDSON: Correct.

14 THE COURT: It could be estimated under 502, right?

15 MR. RICHARDSON: That very quickly so we all know what
16 the impact will be on the fire victim trust, that will hold up
17 plan confirmation proceedings. And for all of the Musicland
18 factors that have already been briefed, we don't think the
19 motion should be allowed.

20 THE COURT: Well, no, but that -- if we had a direct
21 claim just -- suppose we didn't have -- we had just another
22 party who was not a fire party, wasn't in the fire but has
23 an -- asserts a claim against the company that is unliquidated,
24 this Court can estimate it.

25 MR. RICHARDSON: It can.

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 THE COURT: And could even today or now or as part of
2 the pre-confirmation process could do so.

3 MR. RICHARDSON: And if it has no impact on plan
4 confirmation, it might even be able to put it off.

5 THE COURT: Well, but -- correct. But --

6 MR. RICHARDSON: But a claim like this is critical.

7 THE COURT: But why couldn't I make a determination of
8 an estimation of the claims which, therefore, would start with
9 more precisely the analysis on is it derivative or direct? If
10 the former, zero; if the latter, some amount. Whatever that
11 amount might be based upon the evidence, it might be two
12 dollars, it might be twenty billion dollars, but it could be
13 estimated.

14 MR. RICHARDSON: Certainly, if the Court is prepared
15 to grant the motion, that would need to be the type of
16 procedure that would be -- that would follow very quickly. But
17 I would like to explain why these are asserted as derivative
18 claims despite some of the language in the complaint --

19 THE COURT: Okay.

20 MR. RICHARDSON: -- and why these parties are not
21 creditors in this case.

22 THE COURT: Okay.

23 MR. RICHARDSON: The securities plaintiffs have told
24 us that a case called Semtech is the case that proves that they
25 hold direct claims.

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 In Semtech, Central District of California case, the
2 corporation issued undisclosed backdated stock options for a
3 period of years. During the class period, those remained
4 undisclosed, and the financial statements were allegedly better
5 than they should have been had they reflected those obligations
6 and, therefore, the price of the stock was inflated.

7 When they became known, stock price dropped, there
8 were claims for recovery. The court found that those are
9 direct claims under the Securities Act. We don't have anything
10 like that here.

11 These parties have filed a complaint against the
12 directors and officers, the debtors, and third parties alleging
13 that there were a variety of misrepresentations preceding the
14 North Bay fires. Most of them go to vegetation management.
15 Claims that the Vegetation Management Program was in compliance
16 with state law, it was first rate --

17 THE COURT: Right. So I'm aware of it.

18 MR. RICHARDSON: -- putting more money into it.

19 THE COURT: I've read the complaint.

20 MR. RICHARDSON: And then the allege the North Bay
21 fires happened.

22 From page 96 on to page 117, they allege in detail how
23 three days after the North Bay fires, and for the next year and
24 a half, the market and the public and governmental entities
25 started to understand the nature of the liability that the

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 debtors faced for the North Bay fires.

2 Courts typically isolate the damages to determine what
3 is the gravamen of the complaint? They collapse the
4 transactions, so to speak. In this case, the first damages are
5 fire victim damages. The debtors are on the hook for billions
6 and billions of dollars of fire victim damages.

7 THE COURT: Right.

8 MR. RICHARDSON: CPUC fines and so on. The damage
9 that made its way down to shareholders flows from that damage.

10 Under the case law we cited in our opposition, they
11 have to be able to allege separate damage that is not
12 incidental to the damage to the debtors.

13 In the case of Semtech, there was damage based
14 directly on a misrepresentation that was shown to be false:
15 stock dropped. Here, there were alleged misrepresentations,
16 but there was a fire, an intervening tort event that caused
17 billions of dollars of liabilities to the debtors.

18 The debtors, in turn, have claims to go out against
19 their own directors and officers, third parties, contractors,
20 and so on to recover some of those damages, and they've
21 assigned them to the fire victim trust as valuable
22 consideration. But the damages experienced by shareholders are
23 simply a result of those damages to the corporation. They are
24 not separate; they are merely incidental.

25 The case that actually is similar to this is one we've

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 cited in our opposition on pages 7 and 8 called Touch America.
2 The Touch America case was the Chapter 11 case of the former
3 Montana Power Company. It was a regulated electric utility in
4 Montana. At the time, it was the counterpart of PG&E in
5 Montana until its Wall Street advisors convinced it that it
6 should sell off most of its utility assets and turn itself into
7 a telecom company just as the telecom industry was collapsing.
8 It ended up in Chapter 11. It's stock and its assets were
9 worthless.

10 Mr. Julian and I now this case well. We represented
11 the committee, and then the post-confirmation trust. The TCC's
12 current FA, Brent Williams, was the trustee, and we pursued
13 assigned D&O claims for the trust against directors and
14 officers.

15 At the same time, shareholders were claiming that they
16 had direct claims under the Securities Act because they were
17 denied the right to vote on this restructuring.

18 We went before Judge Carey in the Delaware Bankruptcy
19 Court and he, essentially, collapsed the transaction to
20 determine the true nature of the damages. He determined that
21 the damages were not caused by a lack of a vote, that the
22 shareholders were not separately damaged by a lack of a vote.
23 The damages were the restructuring that went forward at an
24 inopportune time, caused damage to the corporation, put it in
25 bankruptcy, and left the shareholders with shares of no value.

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 The critical point here is that it is not enough to
2 allege that there were misrepresentations, violations of the
3 Securities Act, and our shares went down. If the shares go
4 down because of the larger injury to the corporation, and what
5 we have here is a larger injury to the corporation.

6 Every single derivative action against Ds and Os
7 involves omissions, misstatements that could be styled as
8 securities direct claims if it wasn't for the requirement that
9 they show separate damages.

10 No corporation says we're issuing an announcement that
11 our directors and officers are committing negligence, so you
12 shouldn't buy our stock right now. Rather, that comes out in
13 the derivative claims that there were misrepresentations or
14 omissions. No one was told about the negligence or the
15 violations.

16 But unless shareholders can show that they had a
17 separate injury that did not flow from the larger injury to the
18 corporation, they do not have direct claims, and that is where
19 we are in this case. Stock dropped in value because of fire
20 damages that have put these companies in bankruptcy.

21 It would be a very different case if a month before
22 the North Bay fires PG&E had put out a statement saying it's
23 come to our attention that our Vegetation Management Program is
24 not compliant with California law. The next day, the stock
25 might have dropped a percent or two. It would have reflected

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 the adjustment of -- accounted for that misrepresentation
2 because now shareholders would recognize that they have been
3 misled and there might be a greater risk of a possible fire
4 down the road. We don't have that here. That would have been
5 Semtech. What we have is a fire that caused major damage to
6 the corporation and flowed down to shareholders just as it
7 flowed down to every other party in these cases.

8 THE COURT: And why is that -- isn't it different from
9 a company that says we're doing everything properly when, in
10 fact, they weren't doing it properly?

11 MR. RICHARDSON: I'm not saying there weren't
12 misrepresentations. That's element one.

13 THE COURT: But well, again --

14 MR. RICHARDSON: -- of the direct claim.

15 THE COURT: Okay. So we're -- and we're doing it
16 properly when, in fact, they were not doing it properly, and
17 then, of course, there were the fires and that's what,
18 obviously, was so precipitous. But wasn't there not damage to
19 the individual shares that that -- even before the fire then
20 because of the misrepresentation?

21 MR. RICHARDSON: The misrepresentations, they were --

22 THE COURT: If I bought the stock in reliance on the
23 management telling me everything's hunky-dory, we're not doing
24 fire, we're not at any fire risk, aren't I misled if I'm not
25 told they were cooking the books and falsifying the records?

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 MR. RICHARDSON: And that argument would erase the
2 rule. It would erase all case law that deals with ordinary
3 situations where damages against the company drive it into
4 bankruptcy and the stock drops.

5 Every asbestos case would have had direct shareholder
6 litigation based solely on the fact that they were not told
7 certain aspects about the damages of asbestos before the
8 company went into bankruptcy.

9 THE COURT: Well, if the company had filed bankruptcy
10 before the fires for other reasons, there might have been a
11 claim for you didn't tell me that the stock was going to -- was
12 false. You didn't tell me that the misrpre -- the statements
13 about compliance were not true.

14 MR. RICHARDSON: Correct. That --

15 THE COURT: Right?

16 MR. RICHARDSON: -- that is an argument that erases
17 the rule. The Court --

18 THE COURT: Well, I guess I'm not following you when
19 you -- explain that again. I don't understand what you would
20 mean by erases the rule. Which rule? The rule that there can
21 be no direct claim?

22 MR. RICHARDSON: Yes. The rule that requires that in
23 order for there to be a direct claim, they have to have a
24 separate measure of damages that is distinct from the damage to
25 the corporation.

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 THE COURT: Yeah, but --

2 MR. RICHARDSON: If there --

3 THE COURT: Okay.

4 MR. RICHARDSON: Let me put it this way.

5 THE COURT: Okay. Okay.

6 MR. RICHARDSON: If there had not been a North Bay
7 fire, six months later the stock would likely have been at
8 around the same level, maybe higher. They could have sold
9 their stock and made a good investment on it. They weren't
10 harmed by the misrepresentation until there was a fire that
11 destroyed the company.

12 THE COURT: Okay.

13 MR. RICHARDSON: The damage that they incurred is a
14 result of the fire. It flows from the fire and is not
15 independent. Because it is not independent, the claims that
16 they have alleged that say that all of their damages stem from
17 the North Bay fire and a realization, the impact it would have
18 on the company are derivative claims --

19 THE COURT: Are derivative.

20 MR. RICHARDSON: -- and, therefore, they're not
21 entitled to notice, they cannot file a claim in this case, and
22 more importantly if they have not alleged -- I'm not asking the
23 Court to make a final ruling on whether these claims are final
24 or direct, it goes to what they've alleged at this point -- if
25 they have not alleged direct claims properly by not alleging

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 separate and distinct damages, then they should not be allowed
2 to upset the plan confirmation process at this late stage. It
3 goes to the Musicland factors as well as going to the question
4 of whether they're even creditors of the estate.

5 THE COURT: Okay. I appreciate your point. All
6 right.

7 MR. RICHARDSON: Okay.

8 THE COURT: I'll hear -- I have ten minutes for
9 plaintiffs, and then we're going to --

10 MR. KAROTKIN: Your Honor, may I have a couple of
11 minutes at some point?

12 THE COURT: Sure. Go ahead. I didn't know I was
13 going to hear from you, but Mr. Karotkin.

14 MR. KAROTKIN: Your Honor, Steven Karotkin, Weil,
15 Gotshal & Manges for the debtors.

16 Just to address a point or two that you raised about
17 gumming up the works. And I think this is a classic case of
18 gumming up the works, and I think it's important to keep in
19 mind, Your Honor, that the debtor's plan is premised on twelve
20 billion dollars of new equity investments; many of which are
21 coming from existing equity holders.

22 The impact of this potential claim on that investment,
23 not only from the standpoint of how much equity will those
24 people own in the reorganized entity from the standpoint, also,
25 of how much of their existing holdings will be diluted by this

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 potential class proof of claim will substantially gum up the
2 works here, Your Honor.

3 A couple of other things. This is not just equity.
4 They're also asserting claims for cash based on notes to the
5 tune of several hundred million dollars, additional financing
6 if they are successful that will have to be required for plan
7 confirmation.

8 And Your Honor, I'd just like to go back to one thing
9 Mr. Slack alluded to that you didn't find terribly compelling.
10 The fact of the matter is where were they -- and I know you say
11 these are not fire claims -- but where were these people when
12 the bar-date motion was filed? Where were they? Why didn't
13 they come in like other people came in --

14 THE COURT: Well, listen, I mean he's argued -- Mr.
15 Slack made this argument.

16 MR. KAROTKIN: But let me address it if I could.

17 THE COURT: Yeah. Okay.

18 MR. KAROTKIN: If you would indulge me for a minute.

19 Other people did come in besides fire claimants and
20 said that the notice wasn't robust enough. Why didn't they
21 come in? Why didn't they come in and say well, Your Honor, you
22 know, the debtors should give the notice that counsel referred
23 to today, they should do the class-action procedures? Why
24 didn't they do that? And I think the answer is pretty obvious,
25 because if they had done that, then any effort on their part,

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 on the part of the lawyers to get a class action would never
2 have happened. And therefore, we wouldn't be here today, they
3 wouldn't be seeking class-action status, and if they had really
4 cared about the claimants as opposed to the lawyers being able
5 to prosecute a class action, and I don't want to say, Your
6 Honor, get the fees associated with that, we wouldn't be here
7 today. And that's the whole point of this proceeding.

8 They had plenty of time to come in and ask the Court
9 to give appropriate notice. They didn't. They waited two
10 months before they sought class-action status and why did they
11 do that? I think the answer, that's pretty obvious; because
12 they wanted to wait and try to gum up the works to extract a
13 settlement, and that's why we're here today. Your Honor, this
14 clearly will gum up the works.

15 As you'll hear from me shortly, and as you already
16 know, Your Honor, we have a global consensus here to get this
17 case out of Chapter 11 on a timely basis. This will --

18 THE COURT: Yeah --

19 MR. KAROTKIN: -- gum up the works.

20 THE COURT: Okay. I got to come back -- I will come
21 back to you, but I'm trying to juggle the timing here.

22 All right. So let me hear back from the plaintiffs.
23 Mr. -- well, whose -- which of you is going to do it? Mr.
24 Elkin (sic) or Mr. --

25 MR. ETKIN: I'm going to --

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 THE COURT: Mr. Elkin (sic), please.

2 MR. ETKIN: -- I'm going to deal with a couple of the
3 issues, Your Honor --

4 THE COURT: Yes.

5 MR. ETKIN: -- and Mr. Behlmann will deal with --

6 THE COURT: Okay.

7 MR. ETKIN: -- the notice related issues.

8 Let me work backwards with respect to the TCC's claims
9 of dilution.

10 Your Honor, this -- there's no dilution with respect
11 to the value of the stock. They get 20 -- they get 20.9
12 percent of the stock from a value perspective. This is a
13 question of whether some of those shares of stock would go to
14 satisfy the claims of the frauded investors or not.

15 THE COURT: Well, that is --

16 MR. ETKIN: This has nothing to do with --

17 THE COURT: Well, that's a dilution, then, isn't it?

18 MR. ETKIN: Well, it's a --

19 THE COURT: I mean, of course it is.

20 MR. ETKIN: It's not a dilution to the TCC. They're
21 getting what they're getting. The value that they're
22 getting --

23 THE COURT: I don't quite follow that.

24 MR. ETKIN: Well, Your Honor --

25 THE COURT: That doesn't sound right. That sounds

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 like I'm going to pick your pocket, but you're not going to
2 lose any value.

3 MR. ETKIN: No. We're not picking the TCC's pocket.

4 THE COURT: Well --

5 MR. ETKIN: The TCC's get -- there's going to be a
6 valuation of this debtor, and that's going to determine what
7 the price of the stock of the reorganized debtor is or what the
8 value is, and the TCC gets 20.9 percent of that.

9 Now, there may be dilution --

10 THE COURT: And what if it is lowered because twenty-
11 five -- twenty percent of 2X is -- I mean, twenty percent of X
12 is lower than twenty percent of 2X, because they -- under what
13 we just heard Mr. Richardson point out, if the shares that
14 would otherwise go -- all twenty percent of the shares would go
15 to the victim's trust, a portion of it goes to the plaintiffs'
16 trust -- I mean, the class-action plaintiffs' trust. That
17 sounds like a dilution to me.

18 MR. ETKIN: I don't believe it is a dilution with
19 respect to the value. Your Honor, as we understand it, the
20 fire victims --

21 THE COURT: Well, no, it's not a dilution as to the
22 value. It's a dilution of the pie -- there's another slice of
23 the pie handed to somebody else.

24 MR. ETKIN: Yeah, but not --

25 THE COURT: The pie doesn't get --

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 MR. ETKIN: -- not the fire victim slice.

2 THE COURT: Well, how does -- why -- it's the pie.

3 MR. ETKIN: Because if --

4 THE COURT: The fire victims are getting cash --

5 MR. ETKIN: Correct.

6 THE COURT: -- and equity.

7 MR. ETKIN: Correct. That's correct.

8 THE COURT: Okay.

9 MR. ETKIN: So if the stock -- if the value of the
10 stock, let's say, is 10 billion dollars for the sake of
11 argument, the value remains the value and the fire victims get
12 20.9 percent of that value. We're not -- we're not going to be
13 impacting the value of the stock coming out. We're going to be
14 impacting, perhaps, the stock that's available for existing
15 equity holders under the plan. So I don't see that dilution at
16 all.

17 THE COURT: Okay.

18 MR. ETKIN: Again, we're subordinated creditors. The
19 fire victims are getting value in the form of stock of the
20 reorganized entity, and it's -- I believe, it's 6.75 billion of
21 PG&E common stock. I think that's where it comes out. And
22 it's not less than 20.9 percent of the total. That will --
23 that will be unaffected.

24 Of course, the class members or not going to be
25 signing on because it's just a practical impossibility to

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 participate in the rights offering unless they do so
2 independently. So there's going to be no impact there.

3 There's a slice of stock that's going to be available
4 for distribution to existing holders, and that's where the
5 interest of the frauded investors may come in.

6 Your Honor, the entire derivative claim argument
7 really escapes me totally. They can see that there are
8 misrepresentations. They can see that the misrepresentations
9 may have affected the price of the stock, that the stock ended
10 up being lower because of the misrepresentations, and if they
11 would disclose, there may have been a different approach taken
12 by purchasers of that stock.

13 These are garden variety securities-fraud claims,
14 based upon misrepresentations, and stock that was purchased on
15 an average of fifty-five dollars a share --

16 THE COURT: No, you said that before.

17 MR. ETKIN: -- during the class period, and they end
18 up being worth much, much less, and by virtue of the fires,
19 yes, but because of the failure to disclose whether
20 misrepresentations.

21 Your Honor, what I find baffling is that the debtors
22 pronounced an adversary proceeding in order to enjoin the
23 claims of the class members, but never raised the issue, as I
24 would have assumed they would have if they felt that there was
25 anything to it, that you can't go forward with these claims;

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 they're ours. They're derivative claims. You should be
2 enjoined.

3 Now, that's precisely what the debtor did with respect
4 to the derivative lawsuit that was pending pre-petition. They
5 moved to enforce the stay, Your Honor issued a tentative, and
6 the derivative plaintiff, as they should have, walked away.
7 That's not our case. That's a separate case.

8 Your Honor, the parade of horribles that Mr. Karotkin
9 just laid out we're hearing this for the first time, and,
10 frankly, I'd go back to what the Court said previously about
11 the ability to estimate for voting purposes the ability to
12 resolve these claims. It's really a function -- claims are
13 left unresolved post-confirmation all the time, even large
14 claims, significant claims. It's a function of disclosure,
15 plain and simple.

16 And with respect to the citation of the Amdura
17 court -- the Amdura court's decision by Mr. Slack -- let me
18 just read the quote that appears in our papers. The Amdura
19 court held "publication alone as to members who no longer held
20 securities was insufficient to satisfy due process where
21 representatives have taken all necessary steps to file class
22 proof of claim in bankruptcy case, both debtor and the
23 bankruptcy court were aware of the existence of the individual
24 creditors and debtor could have obtained a list of creditors'
25 names and addresses from representatives." That's what the

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 Amdura court said.

2 And as it relates to the other case that the debtors
3 seem to depend upon for their position, and that's the GAC
4 case, that case was decided in 1982 before all of the
5 jurisprudence with respect to class proofs of claim, and the
6 debentures at issue there were not publicly traded, and the
7 debtors were not even aware that the purchasers had claims
8 according to the GAC court.

9 The debtors were very much aware of the class claims
10 in this case.

11 THE COURT: They were. That's right. Okay, listen, I
12 need to wrap up --

13 MR. ETKIN: Sure.

14 THE COURT: -- so let's hear what Mr. Behlmann's going
15 to --

16 MR. ETKIN: And briefly on Alonso, Your Honor, let me
17 just make a couple of points.

18 First of all, it's not securities litigation, it's not
19 subject to the PSLRA stay --

20 THE COURT: Well, why does that matter?

21 MR. ETKIN: It matters because there was nothing that
22 we could do given the PSLRA stay in terms of pre-petition class
23 certification.

24 THE COURT: You could have filed a motion. You
25 could -- I think the other side's argument is you could have

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 filed your motion for class treatment. The PL -- whatever that
2 acronym is -- that didn't stop -- that doesn't affect you from
3 doing something in the bankruptcy court.

4 MR. ETKIN: That's correct, Your Honor, and we did.
5 We made our motion.

6 THE COURT: Well, no, but I mean, their point is you
7 made your motion way too late.

8 MR. ETKIN: Well --

9 THE COURT: That's the point that I have to reconcile.

10 MR. ETKIN: And I understand that, Your Honor.

11 THE COURT: Okay.

12 MR. ETKIN: We -- I don't want to repeat that --

13 THE COURT: Good.

14 MR. ETKIN: -- during the course of our initial
15 argument.

16 Your Honor, you also held in connection with the --
17 with your tentative ruling that the proof-of-claim process was
18 sufficient to deal with the alleged wrongdoing in the Alonzo
19 case which were wage and hour claims.

20 THE COURT: Yeah.

21 MR. ETKIN: And presumably -- and you noted the
22 difference yourself -- presumably employees know whether
23 they're owed money or not or believe if they're owed money --
24 they're owed money or not. Very different than the
25 circumstances with absent class members.

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 And the last thing I wanted to mention, Your Honor,
2 was let's not forget that the debtor did exactly what you would
3 have to do in order to identify -- this was the Schwab
4 statement that the Court made -- they did exactly what you'd
5 have to do by contacting nominees to identify holders of the
6 stock on the record date.

7 They reached out, and they sent them packets, and the
8 nominees needed to send them out to beneficial holders. The
9 point is that that's precisely what could have been done, and
10 the idea of getting an order of this Court to the extent that
11 it was necessary to compel the nominees to do what the debtors
12 were asking them to do is not, by any stretch, a heavy lift,
13 but even without that order, they were directed to do -- they
14 would have been directed to do something by the bar-date
15 notice, and while you, perhaps, couldn't enforce it by the
16 strength of a court order, that would have, at least,
17 potentially solved the problem.

18 THE COURT: Okay. Let me hear from Mr. Behlmann, and
19 then we're finished.

20 MR. BEHLMANN: I will keep this very brief, Your
21 Honor.

22 There was one point Mr. Slack made that I wanted to
23 respond to. It was -- it was made in passing, but I absolutely
24 cannot leave this unaddressed.

25 Mr. Slack noted that in the debtor's view, notice

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 through nominees is "another form of constructive notice".

2 That is absolutely wrong, completely wrong.

3 Constructive notice, you put the notice out in the
4 world, you put it out in a manner that you hope somebody sees
5 it, but you don't take any steps to actually get the notice
6 into their hands.

7 Actual notice is where you take a reasonable step, you
8 undertake reasonable efforts to get the notice into the hands
9 of the person you want to have the notice. That is what the
10 procedure that Your Honor spoke about in the case of Schwab if
11 you own five shares of ABC, that is an effort, giving that
12 notice to the nominees to put the notice into your hands. That
13 is a form of actual notice. That is why that form of notice is
14 used in securities class actions to comply with Federal Rule of
15 Civil Procedure 23(c)(1)(B) which requires in a (b)(3) class
16 that you give individual notice to class members where you can
17 do so through reasonable effort. That is the reasonable
18 effort.

19 And one final point related to the Amdura case that
20 both Mr. Slack and Mr. Etkin mentioned, the outcome in that
21 case when the district court reversed and remanded, it also
22 held that if the bankruptcy court did not invoke Rule 7023, the
23 debtor would have to go out and give actual notice to all of
24 the absent class members and reopen the bar date for them.
25 That is -- that would gum up the works if anything in this case

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 would gum up the works, and that would be the outcome here.

2 The debtors would like to wave that off and assume the
3 constitutional due-process problem just goes away if this
4 motion is denied. But the problem is still there, and the
5 problem still has to be remedied, and the remedy that we're
6 proposing is infinitely more efficient than anything else
7 that's on the table right now.

8 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you all for your arguments.

9 The matter stands submitted. I'll do my best to deal with it
10 promptly. I can't promise it. I'll do what I can.

11 Mr. Karotkin, I committed to everyone that I would not
12 go on one of my marathon court hearings, can we finish
13 discussing Chapter 11 scheduling, et cetera, by 12:20 so we can
14 take a break before the 1:30 calendar? I have a few questions.
15 I don't know what you and others --

16 MR. KAROTKIN: I have a --

17 THE COURT: -- you have in mind.

18 MR. KAROTKIN: I'm sorry.

19 THE COURT: Well, I mean, I have a few things to raise
20 with you but even if I didn't, do you have a kind of an outline
21 of what you think we should cover, and then would it be better
22 just to resume and start later at the -- the Tubbs hearing this
23 afternoon is discrete? It's only -- I've only allowed a short
24 period of time. What do you think would be more efficient?

25 MR. KAROTKIN: I think I could give a brief statement

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 on the status conference --

2 THE COURT: Okay.

3 MR. KAROTKIN: -- in five or ten minutes, and I have a
4 proposed time line for moving the cases forward that I could
5 submit and hand up to the Court.

6 THE COURT: Okay. Let me, then, give you a -- not
7 something you need to respond to, but it's sort of on my to-do
8 list, and maybe it's part of -- it's on your list as well. And
9 so in no particular order here are things that I feel that I
10 need to make sure we deal with.

11 There was a recent letter that I'm sure you were
12 copied from counsel for the trade creditors about asking that
13 there be some resolution to make the pre -- post-petition
14 interest matter get teed up to be certified. So I'd like to
15 hear from you on that. And when we can, I had on my list that
16 I need to have a -- some critical dates for targets, at least,
17 for when the plan -- the latest version of the plan will be
18 filed, when you think we should have a disclosure statement.

19 Then on a broader subject, this question that I raised
20 on a couple of earlier orders about the content of it and who's
21 going to get what extent of notice. And then what your idea of
22 a target of the -- of a confirmation schedule would be.

23 Then on another, unrelated to that, we had papers
24 filed earlier by San Francisco and some other creditors dealing
25 with the issue that maybe is academic if the bondholders --

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 senior bondholders' claim is going to go away. So we don't
2 have to worry about the so-called municipalization issue any
3 more, right? You remember that? Those were Valley Clean
4 Energy and South San Joaquin Irrigation and City of San
5 Francisco, they all raised that. You know what I'm talking
6 about?

7 MR. KAROTKIN: I think they spoke with me after one of
8 the hearings.

9 THE COURT: Okay. Well, I mean, they all filed
10 something to take issue what was in the senior bondholders'
11 plan.

12 MR. KAROTKIN: Yes. They've raised that with me.

13 THE COURT: And I assume that goes away now. And --
14 well, you tell me. Those are things that we just need to
15 address.

16 MR. KAROTKIN: Yes.

17 THE COURT: And then the question of the issue about
18 the discharge for governmental entities. Those same three
19 creditors raise that question.

20 And then some time ago the federal government -- I'll
21 say FEMA but it's the attorneys for the government for
22 governmental agencies and the state, various agencies have
23 raised these questions about trust governance, trust structure,
24 trust details, and I hope we've got some information about that
25 to talk about.

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 And then the last thing that's kind of on my to-do
2 list is really a -- it's a rehash of what I said before about
3 the contents of the disclosure statement.

4 It is true that I, and I'm sure many of the TCC
5 counsel and maybe lawyers in your firm are hearing from a lot
6 of people writing to me, writing to you, no doubt, about I
7 don't want stock, what's going to happen, how am I going to get
8 paid, and I am concerned about the precedent that is being
9 followed in a few instances here of moving very, very quickly,
10 and I don't want to move very, very quickly when it's time to
11 make sure that there's an adequate disclosure of the kind of
12 nuts and bolts that has to be disclosed, but also the kind of
13 simplified disclosure statement, or portion of a disclosure
14 statement, that needs to go the tens of thousands of people
15 that just don't need to have a 500-page disclosure statement.

16 You know, I said this before; I hope that's on your
17 list. So your turn. Those are my issues.

18 MR. KAROTKIN: Okay. So just by way of an update
19 which I'm sure you're already aware of -- and by the way,
20 today's the first year anniversary of the fire.

21 THE COURT: That's right. I think I mentioned that to
22 you too.

23 MR. KAROTKIN: So in honor of the first year
24 anniversary, as you're aware on Monday, we filed a motion
25 seeking approval of the restructuring support agreement that we

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company
1 reached with members of the ad hoc committee of senior
2 noteholders and others, and you have set a hearing on that for
3 February 4th. Subject to Your Honor's approval of that
4 restructuring support agreement, the debtors have now achieved
5 a comprehensive global consensus with respect to their Chapter
6 11 plan. Approval of the noteholder RSA will eliminate the ad
7 hoc committee's competing plan.

8 THE COURT: Am I right there; they committed, upon
9 approval, they will withdraw --

10 MR. KAROTKIN: Yes, sir.

11 THE COURT: -- formally withdraw the plan.

12 MR. KAROTKIN: Formally withdraw.

13 THE COURT: Okay.

14 MR. KAROTKIN: They will withdraw their motion for
15 reconsideration -- or suspend their motion for reconsideration
16 with respect to Your Honor's orders approving the tort
17 claimant's RSA and the subrogation claimants' RSA.

18 The make whole dispute will be suspended as well
19 because that's resolved as part of the plan treatment.

20 The dispute as to post-petition interest with respect
21 to their claims has been resolved, and they will withdraw their
22 objection to the debtor's request that Your Honor approve the
23 terms of financing for their plan.

24 THE COURT: So again, I haven't had a time -- an
25 opportunity to review the new RSA, but do I assume that that

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 plus whatever the next iteration of a plan will put into play
2 in the plan, the compromise of the post-petition interest and
3 the --

4 MR. KAROTKIN: Yes, sir.

5 THE COURT: -- make whole treatment?

6 MR. KAROTKIN: Yes, sir.

7 THE COURT: Okay.

8 MR. KAROTKIN: The plan will be revised to reflect the
9 treatment that's been --

10 THE COURT: So you're not -- this is not being
11 addressed as a traditional 9019 settlement or anything, it's
12 just it's the plan and --

13 MR. KAROTKIN: It's the plan.

14 THE COURT: -- they've agreed to it.

15 MR. KAROTKIN: Yes.

16 THE COURT: Okay.

17 MR. KAROTKIN: And they've agreed to support the plan
18 moving forward.

19 THE COURT: Right.

20 MR. KAROTKIN: And as we've indicated in our
21 pleadings, we believe that with this restructuring support
22 agreement, the debtor's cases are now on a smooth path toward
23 confirmation within a time line of AB 1054, June 30th.

24 You mentioned the ad hoc trade committee, we will hear
25 from then and we can address the issues with respect to the

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 post-petition interest, but I'll save that for later.

2 We don't believe that's any impediment to moving
3 forward with confirmation of a plan.

4 THE COURT: Well, I mean, we can -- are you willing to
5 have me turn that into an order and make a 54(b) certification
6 on that issue?

7 MR. KAROTKIN: Well, Your Honor, we think it's more
8 appropriate for that to be deferred until confirmation. You
9 can rule on that and have that order issued in connection with
10 the confirmation hearing, because as you said it is a
11 confirmation matter. I think that risks two appeals. One that
12 could happen now and one that could happen in connection with
13 the confirmation order --

14 THE COURT: Yeah.

15 MR. KAROTKIN: -- and appealed by other parties. We
16 don't think that's the right way to proceed.

17 THE COURT: Is the new version of the plan going to
18 set aside a reserve in case that -- that particular issue goes
19 the other way? I mean, are you --

20 MR. KAROTKIN: It is not our intention to do so,
21 but --

22 THE COURT: Well, you had -- it was in the prior plan,
23 though, right?

24 MR. KAROTKIN: In the prior, yes, we provided that we
25 would modify the plan to the extent Your Honor ruled against

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 us.

2 THE COURT: Right.

3 MR. KAROTKIN: Your Honor has not ruled -- you ruled
4 in our favor.

5 THE COURT: Right.

6 MR. KAROTKIN: So we don't see any reason to do --

7 THE COURT: And in simple terms -- right. If I had
8 said that you have to pay contract interest, you would have --
9 I think -- or thought you would say you were going to commit to
10 it but reserve the right to appeal it and scale it back.

11 MR. KAROTKIN: Yes, but you ruled the other way.

12 THE COURT: Correct.

13 MR. KAROTKIN: So there's no reason to put in the plan
14 that we will treat them differently from what you've already
15 ruled.

16 THE COURT: But are you going to be in a position to
17 protect against an adverse ruling against -- in favor of those
18 who might appeal that aspect of the plan?

19 MR. KAROTKIN: Your Honor, I think that that's
20 something you can address at the confirmation hearing.

21 THE COURT: Okay. So you're view at the moment for
22 the reasons you stated, this is not something that should be
23 the subject of an order now.

24 MR. KAROTKIN: Right. This is no longer a gating
25 issue in view of the settlement with the bondholders. This

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 is --

2 THE COURT: Well, that's what I assumed.

3 MR. KAROTKIN: Yes. Okay.

4 Now, Your Honor, we're well aware of the issues that
5 have been raised by the governor's office with respect to the
6 debtor's plan. We are engaged in, what I believe, are
7 constructive discussions with the governor's office, and I
8 believe that we will be able to resolve those concerns.

9 We are also moving forward with the CPUC approval
10 process.

11 And as I mentioned, with all of these accomplishments
12 and the global consensus that's been achieved, we're on track
13 to meet the June 30, 2020 deadline.

14 Now, addressing a proposed timetable for the
15 disclosure statement, could I approach?

16 THE COURT: Yeah, and I have in front of me for what
17 it's worth, the proposed timetable that you filed before,
18 several months ago, and I'm -- I can look at it if I need to,
19 but I've got it. So we can compare dates here. And --

20 MR. KAROTKIN: So this, Your Honor, is the suggested
21 timetable.

22 THE COURT: Okay, I can read --

23 MR. KAROTKIN: It's not pressed in --

24 THE COURT: -- I can read it, but why don't you --

25 MR. KAROTKIN: Yes.

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 THE COURT: -- just state it so -- for those who don't
2 have it or are on the phone or otherwise can hear what you're
3 saying.

4 MR. KAROTKIN: Sure. It's meant to be an indicative
5 timetable. It's not cast in concrete. We're not asking you to
6 enter an order setting forth any particular timetable at this
7 point, but this is how we see things moving forward today
8 subject to your input and others input as well.

9 We would be filing an amended plan at the end of this
10 week which would incorporate the noteholder RSA terms for the
11 treatment of their -- of the claims of those particular
12 creditors and as well as some other cleanup items.

13 On February 7th, we would propose to file a draft
14 disclosure statement, as well as a motion seeking approval of
15 the disclosure statement, solicitation procedures, ballots,
16 notice, and setting a hearing to consider confirmation of the
17 plan.

18 THE COURT: So how -- when would you want that to be
19 heard?

20 MR. KAROTKIN: Well, then, that's March 11th. If you
21 look at the next date --

22 THE COURT: Um --

23 MR. KAROTKIN: -- we would ask that that be heard --
24 suggest that that -- the hearing to consider approval of the
25 disclosure statement as well as the voting procedures be set

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 for March 11th. And we haven't -- by the way, Your Honor, we
2 haven't checked any of these dates with your --

3 THE COURT: No, that's okay. I mean, I assume that I
4 belong to you for the coming months. Well, let me just tell
5 you ahead of time, I'm going to -- I'm going to put in an
6 intermediate time by which objections have to be filed and a
7 meet and confer for principal players, and possibly even --
8 well, at least that, because a lot of -- my view is objection
9 to disclosure statement can easily be dealt with by disclosing
10 more.

11 MR. KAROTKIN: Exactly.

12 THE COURT: Except in the case where we want to keep
13 the disclosures relatively simple.

14 MR. KAROTKIN: Yes. And I will tell you, we -- we
15 have taken your admonition that this is -- the draft that will
16 be filed, will be substantially different from disclosure
17 statements that I think people in this room have been familiar
18 with in other cases. It is not a telephone book. We have
19 tried to make it relatively simple. We have tried to gear it
20 toward the fire claimants which we think is critically
21 important here. I am sure people will have comments, but that
22 is how we have approached this taking --

23 THE COURT: Are you free to tell me there's been some
24 colloquy with representatives of the TCC on that -- on the very
25 same subject on the disclosures?

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 MR. KAROTKIN: Yes.

2 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes, sir.

3 THE COURT: Okay. Good. Okay. Well, we can come
4 back later to -- I mean, you go ahead and finish with the
5 sequence here.

6 MR. KAROTKIN: Sure. Assuming approval of the
7 disclosure statement and solicitation period within the time
8 frame, the March 11th time frame, we would see a deadline to
9 vote of May 15th, 2020. I think, Your Honor, it's important to
10 keep in mind the extent of the notice that has to be given with
11 respect to voting in view of the tens of thousands of fire
12 claimants, the public shareholders, other creditors. It's a
13 massive undertaking so we have --

14 THE COURT: I'm well aware of that.

15 MR. KAROTKIN: -- and we want to make sure that,
16 particularly, the fire claimants have sufficient time to vote.
17 And we've been working, by the way, with the -- with the tort
18 claimants' committee and the attorneys to -- I don't like to
19 call it streamline, but to come up with a very, very efficient
20 manner in which to solicit the votes of fire claimants. It
21 will be something a little different from what you're
22 accustomed to.

23 THE COURT: Good.

24 MR. KAROTKIN: But we have been working very, very
25 closely with them to come up with a process that facilitates

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 getting the votes in timely and appropriately.

2 THE COURT: Well, but back up. And again, I presume
3 you've already thinking about this, their votes have to come
4 in, because they have to be able to understand what they're
5 doing, and they don't -- this is back to my no phonebook
6 rule -- and I went back and looked at the national rules, and
7 the national rules allow you some flexibility in disclosures,
8 and then there's kind of disclosures of disclosures. And so
9 you could have a summary, and then refer anyone to the more
10 detailed --

11 MR. KAROTKIN: Yes.

12 THE COURT: -- if they wanted, either through website
13 or access. Okay. You're on top of it, I hope. I think.

14 MR. KAROTKIN: Yes. We're trying. We're trying.

15 So again, based on that time line with the voting
16 deadline of May 15th, we would also have the same date as the
17 date for filing of objections to confirmation.

18 THE COURT: Okay. On that subject, again, it's been
19 my practice, and I think it would be important on this case is
20 to have a status conference by and attended by principal
21 counsel of objectors. I mean, we have principal counsel on
22 everything here, but the point is, if creditor A is objecting
23 to confirmation, I want creditors' A lawyer at a hearing early
24 on with you and the other principal lawyers to talk about,
25 okay, what are you objecting, what is the legal question to

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 that question, and so on. So I don't want one of these things
2 where they're in the dark.

3 So anticipate, essentially, the equivalent of a trial
4 scheduling conference and an adversary proceeding with the
5 adversary proceeding be our confirmation or -- and maybe even
6 necessary, our disclosure statement hearing -- each time that
7 we have a preliminary hearing to see --

8 MR. KAROTKIN: Sure.

9 THE COURT: -- flush out the objections, okay.

10 MR. KAROTKIN: And we can build that into any proposed
11 scheduling order.

12 We would --

13 THE COURT: Well, let me -- let me go back to what
14 that disclosure statement is going to look like in big terms.

15 And again, if you don't recall -- because I just asked
16 you what was filed by both Mr. Pascuzzi for the State, and I
17 think it was Mr. Troy for the federal agencies, they were
18 fairly detailed about wanting to understand early, rather than
19 later, stuff and took -- I think they both took issue with
20 something in one of your prior drafts that some of these
21 operative documents would be filed much later. That's --
22 that's not going to work. They got to get -- they got to be
23 done early.

24 MR. KAROTKIN: Yes.

25 THE COURT: Is that consistent that at some point

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 early on this time line things like the meet and -- the nuts
2 and bolts of the trust documents are going to be there for
3 people to read and understand?

4 MR. KAROTKIN: Yes. And the TCC has been working hard
5 on getting drafts of those documents completed so that there
6 will be plenty of time for people to review them in the context
7 of voting.

8 THE COURT: Okay. But I mean, it could mean as
9 much -- as simple as just -- it's time just to make sure they
10 know. Again, I'm not suggesting that individual fire claimants
11 shouldn't be allowed to know things, but they're trained and
12 experienced lawyers, and particularly bankruptcy lawyers know
13 how to work through all these details so we don't -- we need
14 the early rather than later disclosure of who's going to be the
15 trustee, what are the rules, what are the procedures for
16 mediation versus mandatory arbitration versus submission, et
17 cetera, et cetera. So that -- those are all on your list,
18 right?

19 MR. KAROTKIN: They're all on my list.

20 THE COURT: Okay.

21 MR. KAROTKIN: Yes.

22 THE COURT: Okay.

23 MR. KAROTKIN: All of those items may not be in the
24 initial draft of the disclosure statement, but by the time it's
25 approved it will include all of that information, but we need

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 to get the time -- we need to get the process moving, Your
2 Honor, in order to meet the deadline.

3 THE COURT: Yeah. No, I'm well aware of that. And is
4 this, in your mind, is this consistent with the OII and what's
5 going on in CPUC?

6 MR. KAROTKIN: Yes.

7 THE COURT: What will I be looking at -- and you're
8 going to say the plan or the disclosure statement. Let me try
9 it a different way. How are you going to show compliance with
10 1054 as distinguished from the Bankruptcy Code? You and I and
11 every bankruptcy lawyer in the room knows the checklist in
12 Section 1129, but not many of us know what it takes to pass
13 muster with 1054. I'm sure you do more than I do. So how are
14 you going to address that? How will that be on the table where
15 at least the prima facie case for compliance with that statute
16 will be demonstrated?

17 MR. KAROTKIN: I don't think, Your Honor, that would
18 be in a disclosure statement. I think that would be in a
19 subsequent submission in connection with, for example, filing
20 our brief --

21 THE COURT: Well, yes. I mean --

22 MR. KAROTKIN: -- in support of confirmation.

23 THE COURT: The governor, I mean, I'm not going to say
24 the governor can't vote. We know who can vote on the plan.
25 But whatever it takes to satisfy 1054, to me it isn't -- it

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 probably isn't a disclosure item. It's like if you -- I think
2 I gave the example in the first PG&E case. Well, you still
3 have to show how you're complying with other law, so --

4 MR. KAROTKIN: Yes.

5 THE COURT: So to the extent that other laws -- and by
6 the way, this is what Mr. Pascuzzi said specifically. There
7 are a whole long list of other California laws that those
8 agencies need to be satisfied are being dealt with. And that's
9 an example that is on my list. That's the same thing I would
10 put in that 1054. So how are you going to show that?

11 MR. KAROTKIN: I think that that would be something we
12 would demonstrate in the context of the confirmation hearing.
13 We would be submitting a brief in support of confirmation. I
14 know that Mr. Kornberg's client has the ultimate voice on
15 compliance with AB 1054, and hopefully he will be in a position
16 to stand up in court at the appropriate time to say that the
17 plan complies.

18 THE COURT: Well, I'm hopeful, because you've said you
19 are confident that you're going to work with the governor. But
20 what do we do if the debtor says I'm in compliance and the
21 governor's office says you're not? Is that something I decide
22 or the governor decides? Or Mr. Kornberg decides?

23 MR. KAROTKIN: I think it's something Mr. Kornberg's
24 client decides, but I don't think we have to get into that
25 today.

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 THE COURT: That's fine. I'm not. I'm not getting
2 into any of the merits of it.

3 MR. KAROTKIN: Right.

4 THE COURT: But it's just a question of scheduling.
5 Well, do you want to have me approve this?

6 MR. KAROTKIN: No.

7 THE COURT: Or do you want me to -- what do you want
8 me to do?

9 MR. KAROTKIN: I want you to say you think this looks
10 like a reasonable schedule.

11 THE COURT: Well, let's see what you told me last
12 time. Your original disclosure statement was January 15th.
13 Then we had the estimation, et cetera. We had amended plan and
14 amended disclosure statement March 10th, so --

15 MR. KAROTKIN: How about that, huh?

16 THE COURT: How about that? Hearing on approval of
17 the disclosure statement was March 20th. So yes, and --

18 MR. KAROTKIN: As you know, that was in the context of
19 a much more contested thing.

20 THE COURT: No, I understand that.

21 MR. KAROTKIN: And we've been trying to make your life
22 easy.

23 THE COURT: No, I think that again, you know, and Mr.
24 Kornberg and everybody else knows better than I do that if this
25 will fit everything else, it certainly can fit our schedule. I

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 don't know how long we're going to have.

2 Well, can you speculate, assuming no objections --
3 what a wish list -- how long would the confirmation hearing be?
4 I mean, is it going to be -- are you going to do a huge
5 presentation, or is it going to be something that would be a
6 summary? I mean, I don't -- we don't know. I don't know how
7 to --

8 MR. KAROTKIN: Assuming no objections?

9 THE COURT: I don't know how to schedule it, yes.

10 MR. KAROTKIN: Assuming no objections, I think it
11 would be -- we would do it by declaration, and it would be very
12 quick. A declaration setting forth how we meet the
13 requirements of 1129 and the appropriate submissions by the
14 CPUC and any other parties-in-interest.

15 THE COURT: Well, I have a suggestion. See how this
16 works for you. I obviously have to make a decision on the Rule
17 23 motion.

18 MR. KAROTKIN: Right.

19 THE COURT: And you and the others have stressed for
20 me the importance of it, and I understand. It's important
21 either way, and if I deny the motion, it probably makes things
22 easy for scheduling purposes. If I grant it, to use that term,
23 gum up, I mean, it'll impact, perhaps, or require further
24 scheduling, I think. But that's something I'm going to be
25 working on.

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 But what if we set aside some time on the 4th to fill
2 in some of the details on this? And I looked at our calendar,
3 and in the meantime maybe have my courtroom deputy talk to
4 someone on your side, and we start to pencil in more specific
5 dates, such as, for example, what I told you would be the
6 status conference --

7 MR. KAROTKIN: Sure.

8 THE COURT: -- and the requirement that principal
9 counsel participate to discuss confirmation objections and so
10 on. Is that too -- I mean, does that work procedurally in
11 terms of it's only what? Eight days. I mean, no, it's nine
12 days from now, right?

13 MR. KAROTKIN: No.

14 THE COURT: Not even that many.

15 MR. KAROTKIN: No, it's less. It's only, like, four
16 or five days.

17 THE COURT: It's fewer days. It's two days after the
18 Super Bowl.

19 MR. KAROTKIN: It is.

20 THE COURT: It's two days after Groundhog Day. Think
21 of it that way.

22 No, but if we take some time on the 4th, would that
23 work for you?

24 MR. KAROTKIN: Sure.

25 THE COURT: If I respond to you and tell you that.

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 And before we end here now, I'm going to see if anybody wants
2 to be heard.

3 Okay. Well, actually, does anyone want to be heard?

4 Ms. Dumas, do you want to be heard on this? I am
5 going to stick with our schedule, and if we need to resume the
6 hearing this afternoon I'll do it, but I'm not going to go
7 straight through the break. So take your time now if you want,
8 but don't -- if you need more time, we'll have it.

9 MS. DUMAS: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Cecily Dumas,
10 Baker & Hostetler, on behalf of the official committee of tort
11 claimants. I'll be very brief. I like to, however, take the
12 opportunity when I come to the podium to both explain to others
13 who may not be in the room but reading transcripts or
14 listening, and yourself. We are aware, and we are taking very
15 seriously the letters that are sent to Your Honor and posted on
16 the docket. We read them. The team that is managing the
17 website, the official committee website, is addressing some of
18 these questions, and we are aware of the difficulty with so
19 many forms of information that are floating around there of
20 helping everybody get the story straight, because there are
21 community message boards. There are Facebook pages. There are
22 petitions.

23 THE COURT: change.org petitions.

24 MS. DUMAS: Yes. So there are all kinds of ways that
25 victims of the fires are getting information, both correct and

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 incorrect. One of the main seems to be why do I have to take
2 PG&E stock, which is a hundred percent incorrect, and every
3 time that is raised we try to correct that, that the fact that
4 the funding into the trust is comprised partly of stock that
5 will be liquidated by the trustee --

6 THE COURT: That's why our simplified disclosure has
7 to tell them that.

8 MS. DUMAS: Yes. Yes, sir.

9 THE COURT: Don't you agree?

10 MS. DUMAS: We are --

11 THE COURT: You agree? Okay.

12 MS. DUMAS: We are well aware of that.

13 THE COURT: Okay.

14 MS. DUMAS: And our, sort of, it's like whack-a-mole
15 with the various items of misinformation that are out there.

16 I want to confirm Mr. Karotkin's statements a couple
17 of minutes ago that both the TCC and the thirteen requisite
18 tort claimant professionals, requisite fire claimant
19 professionals to the TCC RSA, have been working extremely hard
20 for the last month on the resolution trust agreement.

21 THE COURT: Okay.

22 MS. DUMAS: And the claims resolution procedures.

23 They are not yet ready to be disclosed, but we anticipate that
24 the disclosure statement will include information that will
25 enable anyone receiving that together with the package to

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 understand this is how my claim will be addressed post-
2 confirmation. That's on our minds. It's very important, as
3 well as working with the debtor's on --

4 THE COURT: Plain language, right?

5 MS. DUMAS: In plain language.

6 THE COURT: Plain language.

7 MS. DUMAS: As plain as we can make it, how the
8 noticing procedures will happen, how people will get their
9 ballots, so we're very happy that now all the major
10 constituents -- the public entities, several claimants -- the
11 bondholders, the TCC -- are all now under RSAs, or presumably
12 will be as soon as Your Honor addresses the bondholder RSA, but
13 we see this as a path forward.

14 We concur with Mr. Karotkin's statements that the
15 debtor appears to be hopefully moving toward confirmation of a
16 plan in a time frame that meets the deadline imposed by AB
17 1054. We leave to others the question of compliance, but we
18 are heartened on behalf of the victim class that they will be
19 seeing the light at the end of the tunnel in this bankruptcy
20 case by this summer and a trust formed with the trustee who can
21 begin addressing claims promptly after confirmation.

22 THE COURT: Right. Well, again, going back to the
23 basics that you and I know, that, like, again, this was an
24 example in the first PG&E case, but it's in every case. The
25 bankruptcy court still has to make sure there isn't some

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 violation of some other law, so somebody has to satisfy me that
2 1054 has been complied with, and if it's the CPUC or the
3 governor's office or a stipulation, that does the trick. If
4 not, then somebody needs to persuade me, and I'm sure you need
5 to be satisfied so your clients, your constituents, those
6 thousands of people, will know that there's not some fatal flaw
7 that's going to kill this thing before they're being asked to
8 vote on something.

9 MS. DUMAS: Yes, sir. I'm very pleased to report that
10 the main constituents in the case are in regular
11 communications, hopefully rowing in the same direction, and
12 with respect to our oar, which is really getting accurate
13 information out to the 70,000 plus claimants, we are pulling
14 very hard on that oar constantly.

15 Unless there's any questions, that's --

16 THE COURT: No.

17 MS. DUMAS: -- really all I wanted to update the
18 Court.

19 THE COURT: No. Thank you, Ms. Dumas.

20 MS. DUMAS: Thank you.

21 MR. PASCUZZI: Good afternoon, Your Honor.

22 THE COURT: Yes.

23 MR. PASCUZZI: Paul Pascuzzi for the California State
24 agencies.

25 THE COURT: Good afternoon.

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 MR. PASCUZZI: Your Honor.

2 THE COURT: By the way, I see a number of people
3 standing up. I'm going to break at 12:30 -- and I don't mean
4 to cut you off -- at 1:30 I'm going to hear the Tubbs fire
5 motion, which shouldn't take too long, and I will resume this
6 hearing then. I'm sorry to make it inconvenient for some of
7 you, but we just can't have these marathon sessions.

8 So go ahead.

9 MR. PASCUZZI: Thank you, Your Honor. I appreciate
10 the Court raising the issues with the trust disclosures. I
11 didn't hear a commitment that things would be filed in
12 connection with the disclosure statement, but we filed our
13 pleading reserving our right, so --

14 THE COURT: Well, you filed them some time ago.

15 MR. PASCUZZI: Yes.

16 THE COURT: But you -- was I right, though -- you had
17 a laundry list of other issues that --

18 MR. PASCUZZI: Correct.

19 THE COURT: -- weren't trust related. They were Clean
20 Water Act and the prior -- well, you even dug up bankruptcy
21 PG&E 1.

22 MR. PASCUZZI: Correct.

23 THE COURT: And those are issues that hopefully you
24 can take up directly with the debtor's representatives, but we
25 have to deal with them --

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 MR. PASCUZZI: Right.

2 THE COURT: -- at some point in terms of scheduling.

3 MR. PASCUZZI: Yes. And we have done that, Your
4 Honor.

5 The other thing I wanted to point out, Your Honor, is
6 that the debtor's plan, and it always has, puts the California
7 State Agency fire-related claims in the fire victim trust.

8 THE COURT: Right.

9 MR. PASCUZZI: And we do plan to object to that. I
10 don't think it's anything special that you have to set any
11 special scheduling, but we do plan to do that. We've said from
12 the beginning our claims, our fire-related claims, are very
13 different than the fire victims claims. We're talking about
14 about 3.3 billion dollars of claims. A large portion of that
15 is the statutory obligation to recover FEMA funds from the
16 responsible party, PG&E, pursuant to the Stafford Act. There
17 is a much smaller portion, well less than a billion, that is
18 actual State agency funds.

19 So I just wanted, so there's no surprises, to raise
20 that issue with Your Honor.

21 THE COURT: Well, what am I supposed to do about it?

22 MR. PASCUZZI: You're not supposed to do anything
23 about it right now.

24 THE COURT: Yes.

25 MR. PASCUZZI: But there will be briefing in

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 connection with probably the disclosure statement on
2 classification issues on this particular item.

3 THE COURT: Okay.

4 MR. PASCUZZI: Thank you, Your Honor.

5 THE COURT: All right. Well, I'll take a couple of
6 minutes, so --

7 Yes. Okay.

8 MR. MCGILL: Your Honor, Matthew McGill for the ad hoc
9 committee trade claims.

10 THE COURT: Trade claims. Okay.

11 MR. MCGILL: Do you want to hear this now, or should
12 we address this this afternoon?

13 THE COURT: Well, I mean, what's the short answer?
14 You heard that Mr. --

15 MR. MCGILL: The short answer is we --

16 THE COURT: Mr. Karotkin says he wants to make it a
17 confirmation issue. I mean, I don't --

18 MR. MCGILL: And Your Honor, your order or your ruling
19 on post-petition interests said the only reason you were
20 withholding an order was because of the make whole dispute, and
21 it was related -- the make whole dispute, we now have heard,
22 has been resolved, so there's no reason for the Court to
23 withhold an order on its previously issued ruling on December
24 30.

25 THE COURT: Well, remember, yes I could do that and

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 leave it to you to decide whether you convince somebody to take
2 it as an interlocutory order. I have to decide whether it's
3 the right thing to do to make it a final order. And by the
4 way, some of you, I remember, on the inverse condemnation and
5 in connection with -- in that one, at least, I went two ways.
6 I said a 54(b) or direct appeal to the Court of Appeals. And
7 even interlocutory orders can be the subject of recommendations
8 for direct appeals. It's up to the Court of Appeals.

9 MR. MCGILL: Okay.

10 THE COURT: But I still have to decide, in my mind,
11 that it merits it, and I'm not a hundred percent convinced that
12 I would want to do that unless I'm convinced by you or others
13 that I should do it now.

14 MR. MCGILL: Okay.

15 THE COURT: Because I don't want to get -- I'm not
16 supposed to be sending appeals up to the --

17 MR. MCGILL: Right.

18 THE COURT: -- up to the --

19 MR. MCGILL: So let me take it in pieces, okay? So
20 the first point I wanted to make was that you should go ahead
21 now and issue an order that accompanies your December 30
22 ruling.

23 We do agree with Your Honor's previous suggestion that
24 this should be certified under Rule 54(b) as final. It easily
25 satisfies the Ninth Circuit's --

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 THE COURT: Okay. Mr. McGill, hold on. What I'm
2 going to do is the debtor does not want that. You would like
3 it. I just need to let it decide. Maybe I have further
4 argument on it. I don't want to do it now.

5 MR. MCGILL: Okay.

6 THE COURT: Because to just sign the order doesn't do
7 the trick.

8 MR. MCGILL: I understand that.

9 THE COURT: Okay?

10 MR. MCGILL: Right.

11 THE COURT: And there are consequences, as you know,
12 to the 54(b) certification, so --

13 MR. MCGILL: Yes.

14 THE COURT: -- it cuts both ways. Okay.

15 So I'll take it as you want me to do what you said in
16 your papers, and the debtor doesn't want me to do it, and I'll
17 figure out whether I should give you an opportunity to brief it
18 further, but I can't do it now.

19 MR. MCGILL: Okay.

20 THE COURT: Okay?

21 MR. MCGILL: So what's the next step, Your Honor?

22 THE COURT: Well, are you going to be around this
23 afternoon?

24 MR. MCGILL: If you wish, I will be.

25 THE COURT: Well, you don't have to be.

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 MR. MCGILL: I'm sure my clients would want me to be.

2 THE COURT: You'd like to be heard further on the
3 subject, right? So I'll tell you what. We have an important
4 motion coming on the 4th. I don't know whether it's going to
5 be contested or not, but I have more time on the 4th, and so I
6 could take it up on the 4th, or I could take it up this
7 afternoon and hear what Mr. Karotkin says, and if you guys want
8 to submit it on papers or you just want to have just a little
9 further argument, I'll do it either way. It's not a big issue.
10 It's not a gating issue. But it's also something that I
11 don't --

12 To me, when we're dealing with the huge question of
13 make whole, had I been asked to make a ruling on it, or like
14 the inverse condemnation when I made a ruling on it, those are
15 much larger in scope than what is still a lot of money for your
16 clients, but relatively speaking it's much different. So I'm
17 not of the view that I'm doing anyone a favor by teeing it up
18 as a final order at this point. Doing it as an interlocutory
19 order is a no-brainer, because you don't have to do anything.
20 No one has to do anything. So that's what I'd like you to --

21 MR. MCGILL: So just having consulted with the counsel
22 for the other parties, we would like to be heard on the 4th.

23 THE COURT: Okay. Okay.

24 MR. MCGILL: If it suits, Your Honor.

25 THE COURT: Okay. We'll do it on the 4th. How's

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 that? Okay.

2 Ms. Winthrop, are you there?

3 MS. WINTHROP: I am, Your Honor.

4 THE COURT: Okay. You got a couple of minutes, and
5 then I believe the other gentleman is Mr. Abrams, right?

6 MR. ABRAMS: Yes. Correct.

7 THE COURT: Okay. And then I'm going to cut off
8 the --

9 MR. ABRAMS: Your Honor, I just need one minute.

10 THE COURT: Okay.

11 MR. ABRAMS: And I will be one minute.

12 THE COURT: Ms. Winthrop?

13 MS. WINTHROP: Thank you, Your Honor. Rebecca
14 Winthrop, Norton Rose Fulbright, on behalf of the Adventist
15 Health claimants and Feather Canyon independent living
16 facility. We want to add our concerns to the FEMA and CAL
17 FIRE's concerns on the lack of progress on the trust agreement
18 and the trust procedures.

19 We have repeatedly raised this issue. We started out
20 well. We thought we were going to be included in the loop as
21 was represented to you. And as I said, we started out well,
22 but we have been stonewalled for the last two weeks. This is
23 an issue, we think, that should be set on its own briefing
24 schedule. All of the procedures need to be fully disclosed and
25 vetted separate from the disclosure statement. General

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 principles in the disclosure statement are not sufficient to
2 address the problems that we see in the trust agreement, and
3 they are serious problems.

4 THE COURT: Well, I guess what I'm -- okay. Serious
5 problems. But what would we call it? What would this hearing
6 be called?

7 MS. WINTHROP: A review on the adequacy of the trust
8 agreement and related trust procedures.

9 THE COURT: Mr. Karotkin, you said you're going to
10 have your plan to file later this week, and your target is a
11 disclosure statement by the 7th. But when can you -- is there
12 some way you can meet and confer further with Mr. Pascuzzi and
13 Ms. Winthrop, and we can talk about it on the 4th? She's got a
14 good point and so does he. I don't want -- we got to --

15 MR. KAROTKIN: Your Honor, to the extent they're
16 talking about the trust procedures for the TCC's trust, I think
17 that document is in the hands of Ms. Dumas.

18 THE COURT: Okay. Listen. I'm going to take this up
19 at 2:30 today, and if necessary do it over to the 4th.

20 MS. WINTHROP: I will be here.

21 THE COURT: I've got to take my break.

22 Mr. Abrams, I saw you here. I noticed that you filed
23 an amended and renewed objection to the prior RSAs and chose to
24 put it on calendar today. You couldn't just put it on calendar
25 on your own, but that is off calendar. So what is your request

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 today?

2 MR. ABRAMS: Yes. I'm sorry, Your Honor. I am trying
3 to follow the procedures the best I can.

4 THE COURT: Well, it's simply off calendar. I mean,
5 the point is it's off calendar. If you want to be heard and
6 you want to take another shot at those two RSAs, you can file a
7 proper motion. But you can't just, on the 28th, file something
8 and set it on the hearing on the 29th at 1:30. And then I'm
9 told by my clerk that you also wish to object to the new RSA,
10 but you haven't said so.

11 MR. ABRAMS: Well, the new RSA is unchanged in the
12 manner --

13 THE COURT: No, the new RSA hasn't even been filed
14 until a couple of days ago.

15 MR. ABRAMS: It was filed on the same day that I filed
16 my reconsideration.

17 THE COURT: Well, that was yesterday.

18 MR. ABRAMS: Correct, Your Honor.

19 THE COURT: Okay. I don't absorb all -- but I'm not
20 going to hear that. You have a right to be heard on that on
21 the 4th.

22 MR. ABRAMS: And that's all I'm here to do. I'm not
23 here to make my argument. I just want to make sure that I do
24 have the option to be able to be heard on the 4th.

25 THE COURT: What did my order say? It said objections

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 by the 3rd, and the hearing's on the 4th. So if you filed --

2 MR. ABRAMS: Oh. I didn't --

3 THE COURT: But you have --

4 MR. ABRAMS: Sorry.

5 THE COURT: I'm not aware that you filed an objection.

6 MR. ABRAMS: So yes.

7 THE COURT: This document is not an objection to the
8 new RSA with the bondholders.

9 MR. ABRAMS: Okay. So that's as it was intended was
10 that objection.

11 THE COURT: It's not what it says, sir.

12 MR. ABRAMS: Understood. So I will refile if what
13 you're asking is for me to refile and put that --

14 THE COURT: I'm the one that is trying to give
15 everybody a chance, but it's a squeeze. The RSA was filed
16 yesterday, and the hearing, the deadline is next Monday, and
17 the hearing is Tuesday.

18 MR. ABRAMS: And I understand. And with all the
19 shortened time and everything else, I'm doing my best to keep
20 up with the proceeding.

21 THE COURT: I didn't say you weren't. So am I.

22 MR. ABRAMS: It was filed a half hour before I filed
23 my --

24 THE COURT: Mr. Abrams, stop. Stop. There's no
25 deadline running on you. You have until noon on next Monday to

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 object to the current RSA, the new -- I'll call the new RSA.

2 MR. ABRAMS: Okay.

3 THE COURT: If you want me to revisit the ruling on
4 the TCC and the subrogation RSAs, you need to set that as a
5 separate motion.

6 MR. ABRAMS: Okay. I will refile that as a separate
7 motion. I'm also --

8 THE COURT: But you can't just pick a date. We have
9 procedures for that.

10 MR. ABRAMS: I understand.

11 THE COURT: I'm going to --

12 MR. ABRAMS: And again, I'm trying my best to follow
13 the proceed --

14 THE COURT: Mr. Abrams, you've said that three times.

15 MR. ABRAMS: Well, I've tried to say it three times,
16 and I --

17 THE COURT: I know. But I'm trying to tell you what
18 the rules are. So I'm going to conclude this hearing now. I
19 will pick up after the hearing at 1:30. At the end of that
20 hearing, I'll listen to anybody that wants to still be heard on
21 anything that I can't handle today. We've been out here for
22 two-and-a-half hours.

23 MR. ABRAMS: Thank you, Your Honor. One other just
24 scope question. So all of this shortened time, not just for
25 myself but for other claimants to be able to object to the new

PG&E Corp., Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 RSA, it seems like we're trying to squeeze this in too little
2 time for objections, and so --

3 THE COURT: It is a tight -- it's a squeeze. I agree.

4 MR. ABRAMS: Yes. Okay.

5 THE COURT: I can't solve that problem. June 30th is
6 a deadline that we're all trying to live with.

7 We'll resume at 1:30.

8 (Recess from 12:29 p.m., until 1:30 p.m.)

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

C E R T I F I C A T I O N

I, Clara Rubin, certify that the foregoing transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceedings.



/s/ CLARA RUBIN

eScribers

7227 N. 16th Street, Suite #207

Phoenix, AZ 85020

Date: January 30, 2020

[[I]t (1) 58:3	accounts (1) 51:25 accurate (1) 119:12 accustomed (1) 107:22 achieved (2) 100:4;104:12 acknowledge (1) 12:20 acronym (1) 93:2 Act (5) 77:9;79:16;80:3; 120:20;121:16 action (21) 9:11;20:18;28:4; 35:3;15;36:12;14;37:3, 6,17;40:10;13;41:4,6; 69:5,6;72:12;73:5; 80:6;86:1,5 actions (8) 15:18;20;19:13;26:3; 38:1;41:16;66:24; 95:14 actively (1) 11:25 actual (28) 14:14,15;26:20; 32:20;24;33:2,4,9,24; 36:10;40:8;41:15; 43:18;23;44:14;46:9, 14;47:7;53:15;56:6,18; 57:2,7,10;95:7,13,23; 121:18 actually (24) 15:9;18:22;28:7,22; 31:20;32:6;39:20;40:3, 17;44:1;50:10,15,17, 19;56:8;16;57:5,7,8,11; 73:1;78:25;95:5;116:3 ad (4) 100:1,6;101:24; 122:8 add (1) 126:16 addition (1) 46:21 additional (1) 85:5 address (13) 33:1;53:7;57:15; 70:25;71:2;84:16; 85:16;98:15;101:25; 103:20;111:14;122:12; 127:2 addressed (6) 17:11;65:7,7;71:1; 101:11;118:1 addresses (2) 91:25;118:12 addressing (3) 108:2,15,18;109:15; 110:10;113:23;118:22,	118:21 adequacy (1) 127:7 adequate (3) 58:9,13;99:11 adhere (1) 18:3 adjustment (1) 81:1 administration (5) 17:17;23:2;28:1; 47:22;61:15 administrative (2) 28:5,7 admit (1) 33:3 admitted (1) 46:14 admonition (2) 18:11;106:15 adopts (1) 19:9 advance (1) 24:17 advanced (1) 18:6 Adventist (1) 126:14 adversary (5) 23:10;37:5;90:22; 109:4,5 adverse (2) 12:23;103:17 advisors (3) 41:14;71:14;79:5 affect (3) 26:16;43:20;93:2 affected (2) 13:12;90:9 affects (1) 71:4 affirmative (1) 16:10 affirmed (1) 58:2 afforded (1) 23:19 African (1) 55:22 afternoon (8) 96:23;116:6,9; 119:21;25;122:12; 124:23;125:7 again (34) 10:3,18;16:21;19:19; 20:12;21:19;24:20; 31:1;32:7;33:25;43:1; 50:14;55:1;57:21; 61:16;19;62:20;63:4; 65:6;12;66:5;81:13; 82:19;89:18;100:24; 108:2,15,18;109:15; 110:10;113:23;118:22,	23:130:12 against (34) 11:5,19;12:1,8,9,15, 18;22:1;29:23;36:14; 37:7;38:10;39:18,20, 23;41:4;50:19;53:11; 54:8;72:13;74:1,5,7,9, 18;75:23;77:11;78:18; 79:13;80:6;82:3; 102:25;103:17,17 agencies (5) 98:22;22;109:17; 112:8;119:24 Agency (2) 121:7,18 agenda (1) 8:13 ago (9) 38:8;49:10;55:18; 69:6;98:20;104:18; 117:17;120:14;128:14 agree (11) 10:24;17:10;38:19; 39:12;49:3,7,7;117:9, 11;123:23;131:3 agreed (2) 101:14,17 agreement (8) 71:11;99:25;100:4; 101:22;117:20;126:17; 127:2,8 ahead (10) 16:8;17:6;36:24; 43:11;68:18;84:12; 106:5;107:4;120:8; 123:20 allegations (1) 21:5 allege (4) 77:20;22;78:11;80:2 alleged (7) 21:6;78:15;83:16,22, 24,25;93:18 allegedly (2) 71:16;77:4 alleging (2) 77:12;83:25 allow (2) 63:21;108:7 allowances (1) 63:21 allowed (5) 40:18;75:19;84:1; 96:23;110:11 allowing (1) 28:9 allows (1) 71:6 alluded (1) 85:9 almost (1) 63:6 alone (2)	49:6;91:19 along (1) 18:10 Alonso (1) 92:16 Alonzo (23) 29:8,19;45:14,17,18, 21;46:5,6,10,21;47:12, 15;49:2;57:14;61:17, 17,25;62:3;65:10,13, 13,15;93:18 altogether (1) 24:8 always (2) 10:11;121:6 Amdura (7) 53:23,24;91:16,17, 18;92:1;95:19 amended (5) 18:23;105:9;113:13, 14;127:23 America (2) 79:1,2 American (4) 19:11,12;20:9;28:23 among (3) 16:24;71:13;74:18 amount (4) 22:13;31:21;76:10, 11 analysis (2) 18:4;76:9 analyze (1) 18:9 analyzed (1) 75:12 Andrew (1) 9:4 angels (1) 12:19 anniversary (2) 99:20,24 announcement (1) 80:10 anticipate (2) 109:3;117:23 anticipated (3) 23:21;38:13,15 appeal (4) 68:5;103:10,18; 123:6 appealed (3) 19:19;57:19;102:15 appeals (5) 102:11;123:6,8,8,16 appear (2) 18:9;23:20 appears (2) 91:18;118:15 applicable (1) 20:15 application (2) 21:19;26:25
---------------------------	--	---	---	---

applied (1) 36:17	aspects (1) 82:7	98:1,13	bar-date-extension (1) 57:6	best (4) 96:9;128:3;129:19; 130:12
applies (3) 11:16;20:9;38:4	aspirational (1) 10:12	B	based (10) 16:19;23:13;47:13; 74:21;76:11;78:13; 82:6;85:4;90:14; 108:15	better (6) 23:25;43:4;44:7; 77:4;96:21;113:24
apply (2) 17:12;40:1	assert (7) 12:1;33:6;42:20; 62:21;73:13;74:1,4	b3 (1) 95:15	basically (1) 29:5	beyond (4) 52:10;54:24,25; 69:20
appreciate (2) 84:5;120:9	asserted (6) 12:14;39:18,20,23; 47:15;76:17	back (26) 21:9;22:3,8;30:5,5; 40:25;41:24;43:5;46:4; 50:11;55:7;60:19;69:6; 75:8;85:8;86:20,21,22; 91:10;103:10;107:4; 108:2,5,6;109:13; 118:22	basics (1) 118:23	big (3) 67:10;109:14;125:9
apprise (1) 53:18	asserting (3) 11:4;12:4;85:4	backdated (1) 77:2	basis (4) 18:14;35:5;40:19; 86:17	billion (7) 67:25;76:12;84:20; 89:10,20;121:14,17
approach (3) 17:2;90:11;104:15	asserts (1) 75:23	back-of-the-line (3) 25:1,3,10	Bay (7) 77:14,20,23;78:1; 80:22;83:6,17	Billions (7) 22:17;48:5;62:21; 71:16;78:5,6,17
approached (1) 106:22	assets (2) 79:6,8	backwards (1) 87:8	bear (1) 69:11	bind (2) 35:10,10
appropriate (7) 20:16;21:24;27:1; 86:9;102:8;112:16; 114:13	assigned (2) 78:21;79:13	bad (1) 44:10	became (1) 77:7	bit (3) 16:7;28:3;33:7
appropriately (1) 108:1	associated (1) 86:6	baffling (1) 90:21	become (2) 18:15;62:16	blaming (3) 60:20,21,23
approval (9) 99:25;100:3,6,9; 104:9;105:14,24; 107:6;113:16	assume (5) 64:11;96:2;98:13; 100:25;106:3	Baker (2) 70:23;116:10	begin (3) 25:18;47:14;118:21	blanketed (1) 34:19
approve (2) 100:22;113:5	assuming (6) 19:19;24:18;107:6; 114:2,8,10	ball (1) 68:25	beginning (1) 121:12	Blockbuster (3) 58:10,11;66:10
approved (2) 23:6;110:25	attached (1) 67:11	ballgame (1) 50:12	begs (1) 14:2	Bloomberg (1) 30:13
approving (1) 100:16	attempt (5) 41:19;42:9;54:11; 56:17;61:16	ballots (2) 105:15;118:9	behalf (9) 8:21;13:15;20:19; 45:20;74:1,5;116:10; 118:18;126:14	board (1) 32:1
arbitration (1) 110:16	attempts (1) 44:11	Bally (6) 57:17;58:4,7,12; 64:15;66:10	Behlmann (61) 9:4;10:4;19:1;30:22; 31:3,5,7,8,12,15;32:2, 8,15,17;33:12;34:2,7,9, 12;35:6,18,22;36:1,3,7, 9,24;37:10,13,15,20; 38:6,12,18,20,23;39:8, 11,16;40:16,21,23; 41:5,9,12;42:1,6,10,12, 24;43:7,9,12,15;44:6, 16,18,21;87:5;94:18,20	boards (1) 116:21
areas (1) 44:12	attended (1) 108:20	bankruptcies (1) 40:15	Behlmann'll (2) 14:17;22:13	boat (1) 55:19
argue (3) 45:6;73:2;74:14	attention (3) 65:23;66:5;80:23	bankruptcy (41) 14:24;15:21;21:6,23; 32:13;36:11,17,20,21, 21:37:5;40:7,14;41:3, 7;43:21;44:1,4,10,15; 53:8;54:8,22;57:18; 58:12;79:18,25;80:20; 82:4,8,9;91:22,23; 93:3;95:22;110:12; 111:10,11;118:19,25; 120:20	Behlmann's (2) 10:5;92:14	bolts (2) 99:12;110:2
argued (2) 74:20;85:14	automatic (1) 38:5	bankruptcy-notice (1) 36:16	believes (1) 22:24	bondholder (3) 49:11;67:8;118:12
arguing (1) 73:8	automatically (2) 24:19;37:12	banks (1) 50:3	belong (1) 106:4	bondholders (4) 97:25;103:25; 118:11;129:8
argument (26) 10:4;17:7;26:8,9; 27:8;29:23;44:24;46:7, 12;55:2;56:9;57:5,9; 65:14,15;68:10;82:1, 16;85:15;89:11;90:6; 92:25;93:15;124:4; 125:9;128:23	available (2) 89:14;90:3	bar (24) 15:21;20:17;22:5,6, 25:32;20,25;35:9; 39:25;42:20;58:4,14; 59:12;61:22,23,24; 69:7,16,19,21,24;70:3, 4;95:24	beneficial (5) 49:21;50:7,23;52:10; 94:8	bondholders' (2) 98:1,10
arguments (5) 18:6;21:22;49:4; 64:9;96:8	average (5) 30:12,14,17;38:12; 90:15	bar-date (8) 21:18;35:13;38:16; 49:6;51:19;58:22; 85:12;94:14	benefit (1) 74:15	book (4) 35:20;38:3;41:1; 106:18
around (3) 83:8;116:19;124:22	await (1) 25:20		Bernstein (1) 28:20	books (5) 18:8;49:21;51:1,2; 81:25
arrangement (1) 45:2	aware (14) 37:3;77:17;91:23; 92:7,9;99:19,24;104:4;		Bernstein's (1) 28:21	both (14) 18:12;40:25;48:2; 54:8;56:24;64:10;
asbestos (2) 82:5,7	107:14;111:3;116:14, 18;117:12;129:5		besides (1) 85:19	91:22;95:20;109:16, 19;116:12,25;117:17; 124:14
ascertainable (1) 34:25	away (5) 41:19;91:6;96:3;			bought (6) 19:4;21:7;32:10,11, 12;81:22
aside (2) 102:18;115:1				Bowl (1) 115:18
aspect (3) 55:3;73:23;103:18				BR (1) 58:11

break (5) 33:25;96:14;116:7; 120:3;127:21	8:24;10:21;17:18; 19:1;22:5;23:24;25:20; 27:1;29:18;35:10;39:4;	81:7;97:4;101:22; 106:18	chief (1) 10:15	29:23,24;30:16,19,20; 37:10,22;39:3,17,19, 19,22;40:19;46:20,22;
Brent (1) 79:12	40:16;50:8;54:4,16; 62:16;63:1;64:2;66:8;	cash (2) 85:4;89:4	choice (1) 23:23	62:20,21;63:3,5;72:4,9, 14;73:3,9,15;74:25;
brief (8) 31:6;40:4;94:20; 96:25;111:20;112:13; 116:11;124:17	67:21;72:3,7;74:9,13; 75:24,25;80:16;82:20; 90:7,8;95:16;96:10,12, 13;97:15;101:25;	cast (1) 105:5	chose (1) 127:23	76:8,18,25;77:8,9,15; 78:18;79:13,16;80:8,
briefed (2) 26:9;75:18	102:4,9;103:20; 104:18,19,22,24;105:2;	categories (1) 63:11	Circuit (3) 43:18,22;53:13	13,18;83:15,18,23,25; 85:4,11;87:8,14;90:13,
briefing (2) 121:25;126:23	106:9;107:3;109:10; 111:24;113:25;114:2;	category (1) 21:9	Circuit's (1) 123:25	23,25;91:1,12,12,14, 14;92:7,9;93:19;
briefly (2) 22:23;92:16	118:7,20;120:24; 123:7;127:11,12,13;	cause (2) 43:23;69:9	circumstances (8) 18:5;23:12;30:9;	100:21;105:11;117:22;
briefs (2) 17:7;43:10	128:3,6	caused (3) 78:16;79:21;81:5	40:7;41:25;53:16,17; 93:25	118:21;121:7,12,12,13, 14;122:9,10
bring (5) 45:19;62:2;64:6; 69:5,6	candor (1) 16:19	Cecily (1) 116:9	citation (1) 91:16	clarified (1) 75:11
brings (1) 12:4	126:15	cede (1) 43:15	cite (5) 46:17;50:25,25; 53:12;66:11	class (108) 9:11;11:25;13:8,8; 14:12,22,24;15:10,14,
broader (1) 97:19	cap (1) 28:7	Central (1) 77:1	cited (4) 17:14,15,16;18:16;	17,18,20,25;16:4,9;
broadly (1) 60:3	care (7) 11:24,24;13:5;24:24; 60:24,25;73:7	certain (2) 72:13;82:7	19:13,14;20:10,14,18;	19:13,14;20:10,14,18;
broker (1) 52:3	cared (1) 86:4	certainly (8) 12:17;24:14;26:23; 63:6;64:19;73:13; 76:14;113:25	21:23;22:15,16,21,21;	21:23;22:15,16,21,21;
brokerage (2) 54:12;60:22	Carey (1) 79:18	certainty (1) 50:9	23:8,14;24:19;26:3;	23:8,14;24:19;26:3;
Bs (5) 33:5,21;34:24;42:13, 15	Carol (1) 9:11	certification (10) 20:10;25:17,17;29:1; 45:22;49:5;66:6;92:23; 102:5;124:12	28:4,24,24;30:8,8,11, 12,13,16;32:5,15;	28:4,24,24;30:8,8,11, 12,13,16;32:5,15;
build (2) 39:16;109:10	case (96) 16:20;18:11,11,14, 16:19;10,10,12,22;	certifications (1) 33:4	claim (76) 12:15;13:13,19,22, 25:14:5,23,25;15:13;	33:21;35:3;36:4;37:3,
burden (1) 43:22	21:1,21;23:3,5;26:13; 28:2,9,24;33:1;35:4, 21:36:1,10,37:4,16;	certified (9) 15:11;17:15;18:17; 19:15,17;28:24;45:21;	25:25;16:5,9;17:14; 19:2,17,21;20:11;21:3;	6,16;38:1;39:23;40:1,
buy (1) 80:12	38:13,15,24;39:5,9; 42:16;44:4;45:14;46:3;	certify (2) 47:23;48:24	22:16;23:8,14;24:19;	6,9,13,18;41:3,6,16;
buying (1) 52:4	50:24,25;53:12,17,22, 23:54:3,5;57:14,17;	cetera (4) 96:13;110:17,17;	25:19;38:9,10;44:6;	42:19;45:20,21;46:8,
C		113:13	45:19;47:14,16,20,21;	14,24;47:4,7,23;48:4,
CAL (1) 126:16	60:17;62:1,2;64:16; 67:21;68:13;69:18,21;	chance (1) 129:15	53:20;54:14,16;55:23;	24:49:5;51:14;53:24;
calculated (1) 53:18	72:22;74:6;76:21,24, 24:77:1;78:4,10,13,25;	change (1) 50:2	59:24;64:20;65:4,17,	54:1;57:18,21;58:7,14;
calendar (7) 96:14;115:2;127:24, 24,25;128:4,5	79:2,2,10;80:19,21; 82:2,5;83:21;84:17;	changeorg (1) 116:23	25:67:24;71:6,7;72:21,	59:11;61:22,24;64:14,
CALIFORNIA (9) 8:1;9:8;34:19;44:15; 77:1;80:24;112:7; 119:23;121:6	86:17;91:7,7;22;92:2,4, 4,10;93:19;95:10,19, 21,25;102:18;106:12;	changes (2) 47:1;59:5	21,23,23;73:13,14,16, 23:74:1,4,6,7,9,10,16,	18,25;66:3,24;69:5;
Call (4) 8:4;107:19;127:5; 130:1	108:19;111:15;112:2; 118:20,24,24;119:10	Chapter (8) 8:11;30:9;38:13;	17,18;75:21,23;76:6;	73:13;74:7;77:3;85:1;
called (3) 76:24;79:1;127:6	case-by- (1) 18:13	79:2,8;86:17;96:13;	81:14;82:11,21,23;	86:1,5;89:24;90:17,23;
came (2) 59:13;85:13	cased (1) 79:24	100:5	83:21;84:22;85:1;90:6;	91:21;92:5,9,22;93:1,
can (59)	cases (26) 20:8;21:1,4,4;24:6;	Charles (2) 52:3,15	claimants' (2) 100:17;107:18	25:95:14,15,16,24;
	25:17;27:9;30:9;35:7;	checked (1) 106:2	claimant's (1) 100:17	118:18
	38:21;40:4,9,12;53:7;	checklist (1) 111:11	claiming (2) 27:4;79:15	class- (1) 69:5
	54:7;57:15,17;58:17;	Chemetron (1) 50:24	claims (98) 11:4,8,12,16,19;12:1,	class-action (13) 14:23;22:15;29:1,5;
	64:15;66:11;70:8,11;		1,4,8,9,11,14,16,17,18;	35:3;36:23;37:25;
			13:2;15:3,7,8,21;	60:20;64:24;85:23;
			19:13;22:1;23:16,18,	86:3,10;88:16
			19,20;28:5,5,8,25;	

Clean (2) 98:3;120:19	common (2) 71:10;89:21	99:8	consistent (4) 29:18;66:9;109:25; 111:4	8:8;77:2;78:23; 79:24;80:4,5,10,18; 81:6;82:25
cleanup (1) 105:12	communications (1) 119:11	concerns (3) 104:8;126:16,17	constantly (1) 119:14	correctly (1) 65:21
clear (4) 38:24;51:21;63:3; 70:2	community (1) 116:21	conclude (1) 130:18	constituency (2) 27:3,4	counsel (10) 9:8,11;63:13;85:22; 97:12;99:5;108:21,21; 115:9;125:21
clearly (5) 23:3;31:16;41:3; 65:17;86:14	companies (3) 38:22;41:3;80:20	concluded (1) 53:16	constituents (5) 23:24;69:10;118:10; 119:5,10	counterpart (2) 40:14;79:4
CLERK (2) 8:8;128:9	company (16) 13:10;36:15;38:13; 49:17;50:13;52:3; 57:21;75:23;79:3,7;	conclusion (1) 21:22	constitutional (4) 32:24;43:19;44:18; 96:3	countless (1) 68:2
client (3) 15:9;112:14,24	company's (1) 36:12	concrete (1) 105:5	constitutionally (2) 20:16;55:25	country (3) 34:19;35:4;69:16
clients (5) 52:16;68:3;119:5; 125:1,16	compare (1) 104:19	concur (1) 118:14	constructive (22) 46:6;47:8;52:10,11, 14;54:4,5,17,21,23,24; 55:15,24;56:7;57:2,10, 25;58:21;66:6;95:1,3; 104:7	couple (15) 9:19;10:17;27:18; 56:10;64:17;65:2; 84:10;85:3;87:2;92:17; 97:20;117:16;122:5; 126:4;128:14
clock (1) 66:17	compel (1) 94:11	condemnation (2) 123:4;125:14	constructively (1) 52:5	course (7) 27:8;36:11;58:23; 81:17;87:19;89:24; 93:14
closely (1) 107:25	compelling (2) 23:12;85:9	confer (2) 106:7;127:12	constructive-notice (1) 54:12	Court (532) 8:4,5,7,9,13,16,23; 9:1,3,5,7,13,17,17,19, 22,24;10:2,8,10,13,17,
closer (1) 20:23	competing (1) 100:7	conference (4) 97:1;108:20;109:4; 115:6	consultant (1) 40:2	21:11:1,10,13,15,17, 21,24;12:5,6,10,13,19;
closing (1) 68:10	complaining (1) 71:22	confident (1) 112:19	consulted (1) 125:21	13:1,3,22;14:6,10,14, 16,19,21,24;15:2,5,12,
Code (1) 111:10	complaint (10) 18:18,23;22:15;	confirm (1) 117:16	contacting (1) 94:5	17,20;16:7,13,13,14, 15,17,21,23;17:3,5,13,
collapse (1) 78:3	39:20;45:24;73:2; 76:18;77:11,19;78:3	confirmation (35) 19:21;23:7;24:17; 25:20,20;28:6,7;71:5, 7;72:8;75:17;76:4; 84:2;85:7;97:22;	contains (1) 35:9	18,21;18:19,20,22,24; 19:8,9,12,16,19,25;
collapsed (1) 79:19	complaints (1) 39:21	101:23;102:3,8,10,11, 13;103:20;105:16; 108:17,23;109:5; 111:22;112:12,13; 114:3;115:9;118:2,15, 21;122:17	content (1) 97:20	20:2,5,11,13,18;21:1, 13,24;22:3,9,11,19,24;
collapsing (1) 79:7	completed (1) 110:5	confirmed (1) 72:4	contents (1) 99:3	23:18,22;24:4,7,9,12, 20:25:4,6,9,13,15,22,
colleague (3) 10:4;27:21;56:3	Completely (2) 19:8;95:2	conjecture (1) 26:20	contested (2) 113:19;125:5	24,24,25;26:3,6,11,16, 19,22;27:10,12,14,19,
colleagues (3) 8:25;43:3;67:17	compliance (7) 77:15;82:13;111:9, 15;112:15,20;118:17	conjunction (1) 41:14	context (7) 21:20;29:1;53:8; 54:8;110:6;112:12;	21:28;11,13,16,19;
colloquy (2) 31:17;106:24	compliant (1) 80:24	Connaught (2) 19:10;28:21	contract (1) 103:8	29:9,10,12,15,17,21, 25;30:4,16,17,21,23,
combination (1) 57:10	complicated (1) 25:18	connection (10) 11:9;28:4;57:6; 93:16;102:9,12;	contractors (1) 78:19	25;31:4,7,9,10,10,13, 24;32:3,7,9,16;33:11,
coming (9) 9:17,20;55:24;70:9; 71:21;84:21;89:13; 106:4;125:4	complied (2) 53:21;119:2	111:19;120:12;122:1; 123:5	contrary (2) 46:19;53:23	25;34:3,8,11;35:5,12,
comments (1) 106:21	complies (1) 112:17	consensual (1) 40:18	convince (2) 29:17;123:1	16,19,25;36:2,6,8,10, 22;37:9,11,14,18,23;
commit (1) 103:9	comply (1) 95:14	consensus (3) 86:16;100:5;104:12	convinced (4) 66:21;79:5;123:11, 12	38:11,17,19,21;39:4, 10,12,21;40:12,20,22,
commitment (3) 68:13,14;120:11	complying (1) 112:3	consequence (1) 73:24	cooking (1) 81:25	24;41:6,11,24;42:2,7, 11,23;43:1,8,10,14;
committed (2) 96:11;100:8	comprehensive (1) 100:5	consequences (2) 13:13;124:11	coordinated (1) 56:17	44:5,7,17,20,22;45:1,5,
committee (7) 79:11;100:1;101:24; 107:18;116:10,17; 122:9	comprised (1) 117:4	consider (2) 105:16,24	copied (1) 97:12	7,10,15;46:16;47:10, 22;48:1,8,11,14,16,19,
committees (1) 60:9	compromise (1) 101:2	consideration (4) 18:5;21:20;71:11; 78:22	corporate (3) 11:5;12:2;34:4	23,25;49:8,13,18,23, 25;50:4,6,8,16,18,21;
committee's (1) 100:7	computer (1) 31:11	considered (1) 17:11	Corporation (10)	51:6,9,23;52:2,15,19, 23;53:1,9,16,25;54:10, 18,20;55:1,11,19;
committing (1) 80:11	concede (1) 24:16			
	conceded (2) 11:14;73:17			
	concerned (1)			

56:13;57:18;58:2,3,12, 23;59:3,16,18,20; 60:12,18,20;61:4,7,11; 62:3,7,10,12,14,23; 63:1,7,10,13,20,24; 64:2,4,9;65:12,20,24; 66:2,12,19,21,25;67:6, 13,19;68:1,21;69:9,12, 14;70:1,5,9,15,17,19; 71:3,21,23;72:1,10,12, 16,25;73:6,10,15,22; 74:3,8,16,21,23;75:1,3, 7,14,20,24;76:1,5,7,14, 19,22;77:8,17,19,78:7; 79:19;81:8,13,15,22; 82:9,15,17,18;83:1,3,5, 12,19,23;84:5,8,12; 85:14,17;86:8,18,20; 87:1,4,6,15,17,19,23, 25;88:4,10,21,25;89:2, 4,6,8,17;90:16;91:10, 17,19,23;92:1,8,11,14, 20,24;93:3,6,9,11,13, 20;94:4,10,16,18; 95:21,22;96:8,12,17, 19;97:2,5,6;98:9,13,17; 99:21;100:8,11,13,24; 101:5,7,10,14,16,19; 102:4,14,17,22;103:2, 5,7,12,16,21;104:2,16, 22,24;105:1,18,22; 106:3,12,23;107:3,14, 23;108:2,12,18;109:9, 13,25;110:8,20,22; 111:3,7,21,23;112:5, 16,18;113:1,4,7,11,16, 20,23;114:9,15,19; 115:8,14,17,20,25; 116:23;117:6,9,11,13, 21;118:4,6,22,25; 119:16,18,19,22,25; 120:2,10,14,16,19,23; 121:2,8,21,24;122:3,5, 10,13,16,22,25;123:6, 8,10,15,18;124:1,6,9, 11,14,20,22,25;125:2, 23,25;126:4,7,10,12; 127:4,9,18,21;128:4, 13,17,19,25;129:3,5,7, 11,14,21,24;130:3,8, 11,14,17;131:3,5 courtroom (1) 115:3 courts (4) 17:11;19:11;35:10; 78:2 court's (1) 91:17 cover (1) 96:21 covered (1) 18:1 CPUC (5)	78:8;104:9;111:5; 114:14;119:2 creditor (5) 32:18,25;43:21,24; 108:22 creditors (16) 33:16;34:15,24; 43:24;61:25;73:10; 75:5;76:21;84:4;89:18; 91:24;97:12,24;98:19; 105:12;107:12 creditors' (2) 91:24;108:23 critical (5) 43:4;75:6;76:6;80:1; 97:16 critically (1) 106:20 cruise (6) 32:13;42:8;54:10; 55:14,15;56:20 crystal (1) 68:25 crystallize (1) 31:23 current (10) 14:3,13;33:18;39:25; 41:22;46:21;58:5; 71:13;79:12;130:1 currently (1) 23:21 customary (2) 35:2;42:22 customers (1) 33:15 cut (2) 120:4;126:7 cuts (4) 49:14;50:15,19; 124:14 cutting (1) 27:21	date (38) 13:10,11;14:4;20:17; 22:5,6,16,25;23:11; 32:20,25;33:19;39:7, 25;40:1;42:20;45:25; 46:3;47:4;58:4,14; 59:12;61:22,23,24; 69:7,16,19,21,24;70:3, 4;94:6;95:24;105:21; 108:16,17;130:8 dates (5) 15:21;97:16;104:19; 106:2;115:5 David (1) 70:22 Davila (1) 26:12 day (14) 10:24;11:20;14:8; 16:3,10,22;30:1,15; 38:22;39:13;65:16; 80:24;115:20;128:15 daylight (1) 45:16 days (8) 77:23;115:11,12,16, 17,17,20;128:14 deadline (9) 68:15;104:13;107:8; 108:16;111:2;118:16; 129:16,25;131:6 deal (18) 8:10;16:10,21;29:2, 4;30:2;46:10;48:22; 54:7;71:11,18,19;87:2, 5;93:18;96:9;97:10; 120:25 dealing (5) 25:2;55:2;74:19; 97:24;125:12 deals (1) 82:2 dealt (6) 29:3;40:17;53:14; 73:17;106:9;112:8 debenture (1) 53:18 debentures (1) 92:6 debt (2) 13:5;32:11 debtor (26) 12:8,8,15;22:1;27:2, 5;38:10;40:13;43:23; 49:20;72:22,24;73:3,4; 74:13;88:6,7;91:3,22, 24;94:2;95:23;112:20; 118:15;124:2,16 debtors (69) 11:5;12:2,18;18:3,6, 9,12,20;21:16;23:9,14; 24:16;32:19;33:3,8; 34:15,17,25;35:24; dark (1) 109:2	37:5,15,16,21;38:14; 39:1,17,20,22;41:14, 19;42:22;43:16;44:2; 45:12;46:2,5,14,19,20, 22;49:4;51:14,18,22; 54:2;58:13;69:10;71:8; 72:13,17;74:5,7,10,18; 77:12;78:1,5,12,17,18; 84:15;85:22;90:21; 92:2,7,9;94:11;96:2; 100:4 debtors' (7) 13:7;33:18,21,24; 51:1,2;59:23 debtor's (11) 55:23;71:10;73:4; 84:19;94:25;100:22; 101:22;104:6;118:3; 120:24;121:6 depend (1) 92:3 depending (1) 18:15 deputy (1) 115:3 derivative (26) 11:6;12:1,4,8,11,18; 29:24;73:3,5,9,15,16, 23;74:10,25;75:9;76:9, 17;80:6,13;83:18,19; 90:6;91:1,4,6 describe (1) 33:8 despite (2) 30:19;76:18 destroyed (1) 83:11 detail (2) 14:18;77:22 detailed (2) 108:10;109:18 details (3) 98:24;110:13;115:2 determination (3) 26:1;27:6;76:7 determinations (1) 25:9 determine (3) 78:2;79:20;88:6 determined (2) 18:13;79:20 determining (2) 22:17;34:23 difference (9) 47:17,18;49:9,13,14; 55:4;56:19;57:9;93:22 different (20) 26:12;29:21;37:23; 40:11;42:4;46:12,13; 50:12;55:4,12;73:19; 80:21;81:8;90:11; 93:24;106:16;107:21; 111:9;121:13;125:16 differently (2) 36:18;103:14 difficulty (1) 116:18 digits (1) 39:11 dilute (1) 72:5
--	---	--	---

diluted (2) 48:4;84:25	discussion (2) 43:17;61:4	done (19) 16:19;17:22,22; 24:17;31:10;34:25; 38:21;39:5;41:1,2; 42:3,4,9;59:22;60:21; 85:25;94:9;109:23; 121:3		employee (5) 45:19;46:21,22; 49:10;50:13
dilution (18) 48:18,19;63:15;68:4; 71:4,16;74:23;75:10; 87:9,10,17,20;88:9,17, 18,21,22;89:15	discussions (4) 27:2;39:13;60:8; 104:7	E		Employees (11) 8:21;45:20;46:3,23; 47:3;49:16;50:18; 57:22;58:5,7;93:22
direct (25) 11:6,20;12:1;29:24; 53:7;72:23;74:16,17, 24;75:10,20;76:9,25; 77:9;79:16;80:8,18; 81:14;82:5,21,23; 83:24,25;123:6,8	disenfranchised (1) 21:12	earlier (6) 39:5;50:13;69:17; 70:6;97:20,24		employment (2) 57:21;58:7
directed (2) 94:13,14	dismiss (2) 26:9,13	early (7) 69:8,17;108:23; 109:18,23;110:1,14		enable (1) 117:25
direction (1) 119:11	disposes (2) 11:7,11	easily (4) 25:1,20;106:9; 123:24		end (8) 16:3;22:14;30:15; 90:17;105:9;116:1; 118:19;130:19
directive (1) 11:20	dispositive (1) 18:14	easy (2) 113:22;114:22		endeavor (1) 31:5
directly (2) 78:14;120:24	dispute (9) 11:18;12:17;23:19; 32:23;67:9;100:18,20; 122:20,21	effective (1) 62:16		ended (3) 58:7;79:8;90:9
directors (10) 11:19;29:24;36:14; 41:4;72:13;74:1;77:12; 78:19;79:13;80:11	disqualify (1) 24:19	effectively (2) 18:7;61:23		Energy (1) 98:4
discharge (3) 19:22;20:15;98:18	distinct (2) 82:24;84:1	efficient (3) 96:6,24;107:19		enforce (2) 91:5;94:15
disclose (2) 90:11,19	distinction (1) 14:4	effort (5) 68:2;85:25;95:11,17, 18		engaged (1) 104:6
disclosed (3) 99:12;117:23;126:24	distinctions (1) 29:8	efforts (2) 60:8;95:8		enjoin (1) 90:22
disclosing (1) 106:9	distinguish (1) 61:16	Eight (1) 115:11		enjoined (1) 91:2
disclosure (35) 23:5;67:8,14;71:17; 91:14;97:18;99:3,11, 13,13,15;104:15; 105:14,15,25;106:9,16; 107:7;109:6,14; 110:14,24;111:8,18; 112:1;113:12,14,17; 117:6,24;120:12; 122:1;126:25;127:1,11	distinguished (1) 111:10	Either (11) 11:6;13:18;15:13; 26:1;27:11;28:5;31:15; 42:13;108:12;114:21; 125:9		enough (11) 28:21;33:6,7;34:20, 21:43:18;44:15,19; 74:22;80:1;85:20
disclosures (6) 106:13,25;108:7,8,8; 120:10	distribute (1) 16:2	electric (1) 79:3		enter (1) 105:6
discounted (1) 68:11	distributed (1) 52:13	electronically (1) 31:10		entire (5) 22:21;34:18;37:6; 47:1;90:6
discovery (3) 64:13,17;65:5	distribution (4) 16:1,2;56:16;90:4	elegant (1) 29:3		entirely (1) 46:8
discrete (1) 96:23	district (14) 16:24;18:19;23:5; 30:16;35:10,16;36:22; 39:21;57:20;58:2; 69:15;72:12;77:1; 95:21	elegantly (1) 29:2		entities (4) 34:4;77:24;98:18; 118:10
discretion (3) 17:21,22;60:15	district-court (1) 36:11	element (1) 81:12		entitled (11) 31:20;32:6,23;33:2, 23:42;21:64;22:73:11, 12,13;83:21
discretionary (1) 61:9	dive (1) 28:3	eleven (1) 33:17		entity (2) 84:24;89:20
discuss (1) 115:9	divided (1) 63:10	Eleventh (1) 53:13		equity (33) 12:24;13:4,4,9;24:8; 32:1,11;33:18;34:3; 38:12,15,25;42:17; 44:9,9;47:25;48:2,12, 13;62:24;63:7,15,17, 17;67:4,23;68:4;84:20, 21,23;85:3;89:6,15
discussed (2) 28:15;75:11	docket (5) 8:17;9:24;15:3,7; 116:16	eliminate (1) 100:6		equivalent (2) 40:13;109:3
discussing (1) 96:13	document (2) 127:17;129:7	Elkin (2) 86:24;87:1		erase (2) 82:1,2
	documents (3) 109:21;110:2,5	duplicate (1) 15:25		erases (2) 82:16,20
	dollar (1) 64:22	during (12) 21:5,7;22:21;26:8; 27:8;30:12,13;32:10; 33:21;77:3;90:17; 93:14		
	dollars (15) 30:14,18;48:5;62:22; 67:11;71:16;76:12,12;	duty (1) 8:18		
	78:6,17;84:20;85:5; 89:10;90:15;121:14	dynamic (1) 23:23		
	Donato (1) 63:25			

escapes (1) 90:7	event (1) 78:16	117:19	Feather (1) 126:15	final (7) 43:5;83:23,23;95:19; 123:3,24;125:18
especially (1) 18:17	everybody (10) 20:19;38:24;44:14; 54:3,4;60:9;68:13; 113:24;116:20;129:15	F	February (4) 26:10;70:9;100:3; 105:13	finally (1) 69:21
essentially (4) 21:24;34:18;79:19; 109:3	everyone (2) 8:5;96:11	FA (1) 79:12	federal (4) 36:22;95:14;98:20; 109:17	financial (4) 51:24;68:3;71:13; 77:4
established (5) 33:1;35:5,14;61:22, 23	Everything's (2) 39:14;81:23	Facebook (1) 116:21	Fedra (1) 23:4	financing (3) 48:3;85:5;100:23
estate (10) 17:17;27:25;28:2; 47:22;61:15;73:10; 74:5,15;75:6;84:4	evidence (4) 56:5,5,7;76:11	faced (1) 78:1	feel (2) 30:2;97:9	find (3) 29:19;85:9;90:21
estates (1) 74:1	exact (5) 10:14;38:7;39:24; 40:6;46:7	facie (1) 111:15	fees (3) 64:21,24;86:6	fine (3) 27:6;30:3;113:1
	exactly (9) 16:18;18:25;43:2; 52:7;58:12;72:20;94:2, 4;106:11	facilitates (1) 107:25	fellow (1) 23:25	fines (1) 78:8
	example (6) 44:11;111:19;112:2, 9;115:5;118:24	facility (1) 126:16	felt (1) 90:24	finish (2) 96:12;107:4
	except (3) 56:15,15;106:12	fact (17) 12:17;21:18;26:7,24; 30:19;44:10;47:10; 48:7;55:24;57:10;67:1;	FEMA (3) 98:21;121:15;126:16	finished (1) 94:19
et (4) 96:13;110:16,17; 113:13	exception (1) 20:7	factor (9) 18:14,14;47:8;48:18, 20:61:9;63:15;71:6; 75:10	few (6) 30:2;40:16,17;96:14, 19:99:9	fire (47) 12:21;33:15;44:2,12; 55:3;59:13,22;60:24;
ETKIN (140) 8:20,20,23,24;9:2,4, 6,8,10,14,16,21,23; 10:1,3,9,11,16,20,23; 11:8,11,14,16,22;12:3, 7,12,14,25;13:2,21; 14:2,9,12,15,17,20; 15:1,4,7,13,19,22; 16:12,14,16,18;17:1,4, 9,14,20,25;18:23;19:7, 9,18,24;20:1,4,6,14,22; 21:11,14,22:8,10,12, 20:24;2:5,8,10,13;25:3, 5,8,10,14,16,23;26:2,5, 7,14,18,20,23;27:11, 13,17,20,23;28:12,14, 18,20;29:11,14,16,20, 22:30:1,5,22,23,24; 31:17;37:4;38:7;86:25; 87:2,5,7,16,18,20,24; 88:3,5,18,24;89:1,3,5, 7,9,18;90:17;92:13,16, 21:93:4,8,10,12,14,21; 95:20	excuse (2) 56:13;70:20	factors (11) 17:11;18:4,9,13; 47:19;64:8;69:4;74:19, 22:75;18:84:3	fewer (1) 115:17	71:9,15,18,22;75:16, 22,22;78:5,6,16,21;
	excused (1) 41:16	facts (5) 18:5,15;21:6,20; 46:19	fifteen (1) 67:25	80:19;81:3,5,19,24,24; 83:7,10,14,14,17;
	exist (2) 41:13,18	factual (1) 29:19	fifty (1) 10:21	85:11,19;88:20;89:1,4, 11,19;99:20;106:20;
	existed (3) 21:3;37:3;39:22	failure (1) 90:19	fifty-five (3) 30:14,18;90:15	107:11,16,20;110:10; 117:18;120:4;121:7,13
	existence (1) 91:23	fair (2) 31:21;39:8	figure (4) 65:3;66:23;67:2; 124:17	fire-related (2) 121:7,12
	existing (4) 84:21,25;89:14;90:4	fairly (1) 109:18	figured (2) 65:9,10	fires (14) 55:3;59:21;60:2;
	exists (3) 19:13;24:18;75:4	fall (1) 13:2	file (21) 13:18,24;15:22;19:2, 17:20;11:28;25;39:6;	61:5;69:19;77:14,21, 23;78:1;80:22;81:17;
	expected (1) 55:15	false (2) 78:14;82:12	filed (46) 13:13,24;14:23,24; 15:9;18:18;23:10,14,	82:10;90:18;116:25
	experienced (2) 78:22;110:12	falsifying (1) 81:25	17:21;37:5;39:21;	
	expertise (1) 37:25	familiar (2) 17:7;106:17	45:24;46:2;59:21;	
	explain (6) 29:12;34:13;41:19; 76:17;82:19;116:12	far (3) 54:24,25;72:11	61:17;64:20;69:11,24;	
	exploding (1) 20:23	fast (1) 24:22	72:12;77:11;82:9;	
	extension (1) 61:24	fatal (3) 17:23;21:19;119:6	85:12;92:24;93:1;	
	extent (18) 12:3;16:2;22:24; 25:19;30:1;44:12;	fault (1) 39:4	97:18;24;98:9;99:24;	
		favor (3) 103:4,17;125:17	104:17;106:6,16;	
		favored (1) 61:24	109:16,21;120:11,12,	
	extract (1) 86:12	feasibility (2) 28:10;65:8	14:127;22;128:13,15, 15;129:1,5,15,22,22	
	extremely (1)		filling (12) 18:21;21:17;22:25;	

116:19	fraud (1)	88:15;96:3;98:13;	hand (1)	130:18,19,20
flow (1)	38:9	102:18	97:5	hearings (3)
80:17	frauded (2)	Good (31)	handed (1)	59:14;96:12;98:8
flowed (2)	87:14;90:5	8:5,6,9,19,20;9:5,9,	88:23	hearing's (1)
81:6,7	free (1)	13,15,18;28:17;33:6,7;	handle (3)	129:1
flows (2)	106:23	34:17,20,21;35:20;	10:5,6;130:21	heart (1)
78:9;83:14	front (2)	38:3;43:18;44:19;	handled (2)	50:23
flush (1)	56:7;104:16	45:10,11;70:22;83:9;	hands (5)	heartened (1)
109:9	Fulbright (1)	93:13;107:3,23;116:9;	42:25;95:6,8,12;	118:18
focus (1)	126:14	119:21,25;127:14	127:17	heavy (1)
59:22	full (2)	Goren (1)	hang (1)	94:12
folks (7)	51:4;57:24	67:18	28:17	Heffler (5)
9:20;24:25;34:16,23;	fully (4)	Gotshal (1)	36:1,3,12;40:3;42:4	
38:16;42:25;70:8	26:9;47:2;48:19;	84:15	held (8)	
follow (5)	126:24	governance (1)	13:9;21:8;43:22;	
42:15;76:16;87:23;	function (3)	98:23	58:12;91:19,19;93:16;	
128:3;130:12	23:1;91:12,14	government (2)	95:22	
followed (2)	fundamental (4)	98:20,21	help (2)	
36:15;99:9	29:8;30:6;56:9;60:1	governmental (3)	31:14;71:15	
following (1)	funding (4)	77:24;98:18,22	helpful (2)	
82:18	67:5,23;23;117:4	governor (4)	31:19,22	
forget (1)	funds (2)	111:23,24;112:19,22	helping (1)	
94:2	121:15,18	governor's (4)	116:20	
forgetting (1)	further (6)	104:5,7;112:21;	here's (6)	
19:1	114:23;124:3,18;	119:3	13:6;15:10;49:24;	
forgive (1)	125:2,9;127:12	grant (3)	58:3;64:16,18	
19:1	future (1)	24:20;76:15;114:22	hey (1)	
form (7)	74:14	granting (5)	40:4	
52:11,14;59:24;	G	23:1;26:24;29:1;	hiding (1)	
89:19;95:1,13,13		66:15;75:4	52:4	
formally (2)	GAC (3)	grants (1)	higher (1)	
100:11,12	53:12;92:3,8	26:12	83:8	
formed (1)	garden (1)	gravamen (1)	highlighting (1)	
118:20	90:13	78:3	43:13	
former (8)	gating (2)	great (2)	highly (1)	
44:9;45:20;46:22,23;	103:24;125:10	33:8;53:6	16:6	
47:3;58:5;76:10;79:2	gave (4)	greater (1)	himself (1)	
forms (1)	8:17;40:5;41:22;	81:3	47:13	
116:19	112:2	Groundhog (1)	hoc (4)	
forth (4)	gear (1)	115:20	100:1,7;101:24;	
21:21;22:15;105:6;	106:19	group (2)	122:8	
114:12	General (1)	10:24;67:8	hold (6)	
forward (13)	126:25	guarantee (3)	24:20;37:6;43:2;	
45:21;52:19;57:24;	gentleman (1)	41:20,22;50:8	75:16;76:25;124:1	
59:1,14;79:23;90:25;	126:5	guess (12)	holder (8)	
97:4;101:18;102:3;	gets (7)	11:5;12:22;19:20;	14:3,3;32:1,6;34:4;	
104:9;105:7;118:13	13:22;14:22;50:11;	34:4;36:15;37:18;	44:9,9;52:10	
forwarded (1)	52:13;65:7,7;88:8	56:23;67:16;68:5,8;	holders (20)	
41:21	given (9)	82:18;127:4	12:24;13:4;14:13;	
found (1)	13:11;21:2;40:8,14;	guidance (1)	22:17,20;33:18;39:25;	
77:8	42:3;43:23;57:24;	37:24	41:22;47:25;50:1;	
four (2)	92:22;107:10	gum (7)	51:11;53:3,15;63:8;	
13:16;115:15	giving (2)	85:1;86:12,14,19;	67:4;84:21;89:15;90:4;	
four-year (1)	41:15;95:11	95:25;96:1;114:23	94:5,8	
21:5	Glenn (1)	gumming (4)	holding (1)	
frame (3)	29:3	28:14,19;84:17,18	28:23	
107:8,8;118:16	Global (5)	guys (1)	holdings (1)	
FRANCISCO (4)	19:10;29:3;86:16;	125:7	84:25	
8:1;44:7;97:24;98:5	100:5;104:12	H	holds (1)	
Frankly (9)	goes (10)		73:23	
16:5;18:5;20:23;	47:6;56:21;71:6;	half (2)	Honor (170)	
22:22;24:5;40:17;41:9;	72:11;83:24;84:3;	77:24;129:22	8:6,20;9:9,15,18,23;	
42:10;91:10			10:3,12;11:22;12:12,	

25:14:13;16:6,14,19; 17:4,9,9;18:4,6,16; 19:24;20:23;21:12,16; 22:10,23;23:1,16;24:3; 25:12;26:24;27:17,25; 28:15;29:7;30:11;31:3, 12,16,17;32:15;34:12, 15;35:18,22;36:25; 37:21,21;38:6;39:16; 40:16;41:9;43:13; 44:19,25;45:9,11,18; 46:5,25;47:19;48:21; 49:1,2;50:14;51:13,15; 52:7,25;53:24;54:7,9, 15,19;55:9,21;56:1,4,5, 7,10,23;57:3,13;58:10, 17,20;59:1,4,8,9;60:13; 61:8,15,25;62:11,19; 63:14;64:19;65:1,22; 66:5,9;67:16;68:22,24; 69:1;70:18,22,24;73:8, 21:84:10,14,19;85:2,8, 21:86:6,13,16;87:3,10, 24:88:19;90:6,21;91:5, 8;92:16;93:4,10,16; 94:1,21;95:10;99:23; 100:22;102:7,25; 103:3,19;104:4,20; 106:1;107:9;111:2,17; 116:9,15;118:12; 119:21;120:1,9;121:4, 5,20;122:4,8,18; 124:21;125:24;126:3, 9,13;127:15;128:2,18; 130:23	huh (1) 113:15 hundred (6) 33:17;49:3;67:25; 85:5;117:2;123:11 hundreds (3) 40:5;42:19;63:5 hung (1) 65:13 hunky-dory (1) 81:23 hypothetical (7) 14:6;20:3;31:24; 32:1;39:19;56:15; 73:22 hypotheticals (1) 19:2	118:16 impossibility (1) 89:25 impossible (1) 45:23 impressions (1) 59:7 inchoate (1) 39:19 incidental (2) 78:12,24 include (2) 110:25;117:24 included (1) 126:20 including (2) 18:11;46:21 inconvenient (1) 120:6 incorporate (1) 105:10 incorporated (1) 15:15 incorrect (2) 117:1,2 incurred (1) 83:13 indeed (2) 23:7;45:22 independent (3) 83:15,15;126:15 independently (1) 90:2 indicate (1) 15:8 indicated (1) 101:20 indication (1) 22:12 indicative (1) 105:4 individual (13) 13:9,12;15:25;16:4; 19:13;20:14;28:24; 53:20;73:12;81:19; 91:23;95:16;110:10 indulge (1) 85:18 industry (1) 79:7 infinitely (1) 96:6 inflated (1) 77:6 information (11) 51:1,18;21;52:12; 54:2;98:24;110:25; 116:19,25;117:24; 119:13 initial (2) 93:14;110:24 injunction (2) 24:14;26:8	injury (4) 80:4,5,17,17 ink (1) 31:21 inopportune (1) 79:24 input (2) 105:8,8 inside (1) 36:20 insolvent (1) 38:22 instance (1) 35:8 instances (1) 99:9 instead (1) 34:17 insufficient (1) 91:20 insurance (1) 74:13 intend (1) 17:25 intended (1) 129:9 intention (1) 102:20 interest (11) 13:23,23,25;67:10; 68:6;90:5;97:14; 100:20;101:2;102:1; 103:8 interesting (2) 53:24;54:3 interestingly (1) 28:21 interests (2) 43:21;122:19 interlocutory (3) 123:2,7;125:18 intermediate (2) 50:10;106:6 internet (3) 55:18;20;59:7 intervening (1) 78:16 into (35) 12:4;13:3;14:17; 15:15;17:25;21:20; 25:11,14;27:22;28:3, 14;29:16;22;37:4;44:3; 49:17;61:9;62:4;63:10; 68:17;71:11;72:22; 77:18;79:6;82:3,8; 95:6,8,12;101:1;102:5; 109:10;112:24;113:2; 117:4 introduce (1) 8:24 inverse (2) 123:4;125:14 investment (2)	83:9;84:22 investments (1) 84:20 investors (6) 22:1;23:9;30:9; 60:25;87:14;90:5 invitation (1) 45:13 invite (2) 20:18;68:9 invoke (1) 95:22 involved (2) 15:23;60:17 involves (1) 80:7 ironic (1) 69:14 irrelevant (3) 24:11;47:20;73:11 Irrigation (1) 98:4 isolate (1) 78:2 issue (37) 10:5;12:5;14:17; 16:15,21;17:19;18:1; 29:2;31:22;33:1;40:18; 51:13;52:25;54:8; 65:11;22;70:25;71:1; 74:23,24;90:23;92:6; 97:25;98:2,10,17; 102:6,18;103:25; 109:19;121:20;122:17; 123:21;125:9,10; 126:19,23 issued (4) 77:2;91:5;102:9; 122:23 issues (12) 17:8;59:10;70:25; 87:3,7;99:17;101:25; 104:4;120:10,17,23; 122:2 issuing (1) 80:10 item (2) 112:1;122:2 items (4) 67:10;105:12; 110:23;117:15 iteration (2) 23:17;101:1
				J
				JANUARY (9) 8:1;32:14;46:4;47:5, 5;58:6,8;62:5;113:12 Jeff (1) 9:16 jeopardize (2) 66:15;68:12

jeopardy (1) 69:9	116:24	lawsuit (2) 72:17;91:4	light (3) 40:24;74:23;118:19	loss (1) 30:15
Joaquin (1) 98:4	knew (11) 14:4;7;32:3;37:7;8; 39:1,17,22,22;44:10; 62:8	lawyer (2) 108:23;111:11	likelihood (1) 50:11	lot (7) 13:6,6;15:23;41:10; 99:5;106:8;125:15
Journal (2) 55:16;58:16	known (18) 21:3;32:18,25;33:23, 23:34;14,24;35:14; 37:2;39:1;43:23,24; 50:24;51:14,22;53:3,5; 77:7	lawyers (14) 10:11,24;60:8,21; 64:21,24;68:3,9;86:1, 4;99:5;108:24;110:12, 12	Likely (3) 20:6;38:25;83:7	lots (2) 33:10;67:11
Judge (8) 26:12;28:20,21;29:3; 58:2,3;63:25;79:18	lead (3) 9:11;21:18;35:7	line (5) 66:15;97:4;101:23; 108:15;110:1	Lowenstein (1) 8:21	lower (3) 58:2;88:12;90:10
judges (1) 16:24	leaflets (1) 34:18	liquidated (1) 117:5	lowered (1) 88:10	
juggle (1) 86:21	learned (1) 32:13	list (16) 19:5;33:20;51:4; 56:16;91:24;97:8,8,15; 99:2,17;110:17,19; 112:7,9;114:3;120:17	luck (7) 19:6,20;20:7;42:7; 54:11;55:7,10	
Julian (1) 79:10	learns (1) 44:1	listen (4) 85:14;92:11;127:18; 130:20	luckily (1) 56:12	
July (2) 33:20;39:25	least (11) 23:21;39:1;52:6; 63:4;64:12,13;94:16; 97:16;106:8;111:15; 123:5	listening (1) 116:14		M
June (4) 45:20;101:23; 104:13;131:5	leave (4) 14:7;94:24;118:17; 123:1	literally (1) 48:5		
jurisprudence (1) 92:5	leaves (1) 23:23	literature (1) 37:24		
justice (1) 10:15	left (4) 27:20;33:22;79:25; 91:13	litigation (6) 15:14;23:15;25:19; 38:3;82:6;92:18		
justified (1) 66:7	legal (5) 64:21,24;73:23,25; 108:25	little (13) 13:19;14:18;16:7; 28:3;33:7,15;38:8,21; 56:11;66:16;107:21; 125:8;131:1		
justify (1) 49:6	legally (1) 58:9	live (1) 131:6		
K	language (4) 76:18;118:4,5,6	legitimate (1) 39:15		
Karotkin (89) 8:9,12,15;56:3; 67:18;84:10,13,14,14; 85:16,18;86:19;91:8; 96:11,16,18,25;97:3; 98:7,12,16;99:18,23; 100:10,12,14;101:4,6, 8,13,15,17,20;102:7, 15,20,24;103:3,6,11, 13,19,24;104:3,20,23, 25;105:4,20,23;106:11, 14;107:1,6,15,24; 108:11,14;109:8,10,24; 110:4,19,21,23;111:6, 17,22;112:4,11,23; 113:3,6,9,15,18,21; 114:8,10,18;115:7,13, 15,19,24;122:16; 125:7;127:9,15	large (2) 91:13;121:14	lengths (1) 33:8		
Karotkin's (2) 117:16;118:14	larger (4) 80:4,5,17;125:15	less (8) 18:15;22:25;27:4; 63:4;89:22;90:18; 115:15;121:17		
keep (7) 16:24;31:5;84:18; 94:20;106:12;107:10; 129:19	last (10) 14:21;46:11,11; 61:14;66:24;94:1;99:1; 113:11;117:20;126:22	letter (1) 97:11		
kill (1) 119:7	late (9) 9:20;28:9;61:17; 65:11;67:22;69:11,19; 84:2;93:7	letters (2) 71:21;116:15		
kind (10) 13:4;24:22;59:25; 65:6,15;96:20;99:1,11, 12;108:8	lateness (2) 49:5;66:7	letting (1) 43:5		
kinds (1)	latent (1) 21:4	level (2) 48:6;83:8		
	later (11) 28:22;39:6;56:21; 83:7;96:22;102:1; 107:4;109:19,21; 110:14;127:10	levels (1) 50:10		
	latest (1) 97:17	liabilities (1) 78:17		
	latter (1) 76:10	liability (1) 77:25		
	laundry (1) 120:17	liberty (1) 43:20		
	law (11) 9:10;18:11;19:22; 21:21;34:20;77:16;	life (1) 113:21		
	78:10;80:24;82:2; 112:3;119:1	lift (1) 94:12		
	laws (2) 112:5,7			

77:24 massive (1) 107:13 matter (16) 8:11;11:6;12:2; 14:23;19:20;24:23; 32:24;34:20;46:5;57:2; 60:14;85:10;92:20; 96:9;97:14;102:11 matters (4) 12:3,17;16:11;92:21 Matthew (1) 122:8 may (19) 16:20;18:15;31:18; 40:23;41:20;60:5; 64:20,22,23;68:7; 84:10;88:9;90:5,9,11; 107:9;108:16;110:23; 116:13 Maybe (21) 15:5;18:24;34:5; 40:22;41:7;42:4,7; 43:4;52:17,20;53:4; 55:23;60:21;68:5;83:8; 97:8,25;99:5;109:5; 115:3;124:3 McGill (20) 122:8,8,11,15,18; 123:9,14,17,19;124:1, 5,8,10,13,19,21,24; 125:1,21,24 mean (61) 13:1,4;16:18;17:19; 20:20;23:22,23;25:4; 26:3,12;27:2;29:15,25; 31:1;35:16,19;38:19; 39:6,12;41:13,14;42:6; 43:8;44:11;50:16;52:2; 54:20;56:13,21;59:18; 24:70:2,2,5;73:19; 82:20;85:14;87:19; 88:11,16;93:6;96:19; 98:9;102:4,19;106:3; 107:4;108:21;110:8,8; 111:21,23;114:4,6,23; 115:10,11;120:3; 122:13,17;128:4 meaning (2) 46:4;47:1 means (4) 12:8;19:23;38:25; 71:25 meant (2) 25:13;105:4 meantime (1) 115:3 measure (2) 59:11;82:24 mechanism (4) 21:23;29:5;30:7; 53:3 mediated (1)	27:11 mediation (1) 110:16 meet (7) 68:14;104:13;106:7; 110:1;111:2;114:12; 127:12 meets (1) 118:16 member (5) 14:24;20:14;32:5,15; 46:14 members (22) 11:25;14:12;15:14; 17:16;20:10;28:24; 30:11;36:4;40:6;41:15; 42:19;46:23;47:3; 51:14;58:13;89:24; 90:23;91:19;93:25; 95:16,24;100:1 mention (1) 94:1 mentioned (9) 20:8;27:9;38:8;40:3; 41:12;95:20;99:21; 101:24;104:11 merely (2) 73:3;78:24 merits (7) 12:23;16:12;22:2; 30:15;47:11;113:2; 123:11 message (1) 116:21 met (1) 74:15 Mexico (1) 8:22 MF (2) 19:10;29:3 Michael (1) 8:20 MICHAELSON (1) 9:9 Michelson (2) 9:6,7 middle (1) 60:24 might (26) 13:16;19:2;20:18; 24:13,14;26:16;27:14; 28:16;31:19;36:16; 46:23;47:3;62:23; 65:17,17;67:9,14;68:4; 76:4,11,11,12;80:25; 81:3;82:10;103:18 million (4) 33:13,14,15;85:5 millions (1) 63:5 mind (5) 84:19;96:17;107:10; 111:4;123:10	minds (1) 118:2 minimum (2) 43:19;65:2 minority (1) 69:15 minute (3) 85:18;126:9,11 minutes (10) 10:7;30:2;31:1; 44:22;84:8;11:9;7:3; 117:17;122:6;126:4 misdeeds (1) 72:14 misinformation (1) 117:15 misled (2) 81:3,24 misrepresentation (4) 78:14;81:1,20;83:10 misrepresentations (11) 77:13;78:15;80:2,13; 81:12,21;90:8,8,10,14, 20 misrpre (1) 82:12 missing (1) 12:20 misstated (1) 21:5 missstatements (1) 80:7 modify (1) 102:25 moment (5) 8:24;10:14;34:22; 59:21;103:21 Monday (3) 99:24;129:16,25 money (13) 24:8;38:14,15,16,25; 42:17;47:14;52:4; 77:18;93:23,23,24; 125:15 Montana (3) 79:3,4,5 month (4) 64:13;66:17;80:21; 117:20 months (21) 22:25;46:2;48:22; 50:13;55:14,22;61:18; 62:3,5,6;64:5,17;65:2, 2;67:3;69:22,24;83:7; 86:10;104:18;106:4 months' (1) 47:6 moots (1) 26:13 more (24) 13:14;14:18;16:11, 20:18;15:24;16:27;4, 18;59:6;65:13;76:9;	77:18;83:22;96:6,24; 98:3;102:7;106:10; 108:9;111:13;113:19; 115:4;116:8;125:5 morning (19) 8:5,6,9,14,19,20;9:5, 9,13,15,18;10:14; 45:10,11;58:15;66:16; 70:22;73:11;74:20 most (8) 15:17,20;27:3;33:13; 53:4;61:21;77:14;79:6 motion (53) 8:10,17;12:23;19:5, 17;21:17,19,21;22:24; 23:13;24:21;26:24; 27:9;29:2,8;40:21; 46:1;49:6;55:7,13; 57:6,18;58:22;60:6; 61:17,21;62:3;64:6; 66:15;69:22,24;70:10; 74:21;75:5,19;76:15; 85:12;92:24;93:1,5,7; 96:4;99:24;100:14,15; 105:14;114:17,21; 120:5;125:4;128:7; 130:5,7 motions (3) 25:6;26:9,13 motivation (1) 26:16 movants (3) 46:2,8,10 move (1) 99:10 moved (1) 91:5 moving (9) 72:22;97:4;99:9; 101:18;102:2;104:9; 105:7;111:1;118:15 much (21) 18:1;23:9;24:16; 27:20;33:1;48:4;50:2; 58:6;62:15;70:18; 84:23,25;90:18,18; 92:9;109:21;110:9; 113:19;121:17;125:15, 16 muck (1) 66:22 Mullane (2) 33:2;41:24 municipalization (1) 98:2 Musicland (25) 18:11;23:4,7;24:17; 28:1,2,3,6;47:8,19; 56:24,25;57:1,12; 61:19,20,20;69:4,7; 70:3;71:5;74:19,22; 75:17;84:3 must (2)	18:13;71:2 muster (1) 111:13 myself (2) 16:8;130:25
			N	
			name (1) 70:21 namely (1) 58:7 names (2) 49:21;91:25 national (2) 108:6,7 nationwide (1) 54:25 nature (4) 12:11;14:24;77:25; 79:20 necessarily (1) 32:22 necessary (8) 21:22;27:1;53:19; 66:21;91:21;94:11; 109:6;127:19 necessity (1) 53:19 need (29) 20:9;24;24;26:22; 29:25;30:18;48:4; 53:14;63:18;65:9; 74:24;76:15;92:12; 97:7,10,16;98:14; 99:15;104:18;110:13, 25;111:1;112:8;116:5, 8;119:4;124:3;126:9, 24;130:4 needed (1) 94:8 needs (6) 25:19;55:17;65:8; 75:11;99:14;119:4 negatively (1) 23:2 negligence (2) 80:11,14 negotiated (1) 71:8 neutralize (1) 18:7 New (15) 8:22;19:10;20:18; 55:16;58:15;84:20; 100:25;102:17;128:9, 11,13;129:8;130:1,1,25 News (1) 58:15 next (13) 13:6;14:16;24:22; 47:5;48:22;67:7;77:23; 80:24;101:1;105:21;	

124:21;129:16,25 Nicholson (1) 70:20 Nicole (1) 9:14 night (1) 10:25 nine (1) 115:11 nine-month (1) 22:14 ninety-nine (1) 24:5 Ninth (3) 43:18,22;123:25 nobody (1) 50:8 no-brainer (1) 125:19 nominal (1) 73:3 nominally (1) 37:18 nominee (4) 50:9,18;52:4,9 nominees (15) 41:20;50:2;51:3,3,4, 7,12,19;52:10,12;94:5, 8,11;95:1,12 nondebtor (2) 11:3,19 nondispute (1) 11:18 nonfactor (1) 18:17 nonholding (1) 53:18 nonissue (1) 68:7 noon (1) 129:25 nor (2) 15:7;23:8 North (7) 77:14,20,23;78:1; 80:22;83:6,17 Northern (3) 34:18;44:14;69:15 Norton (1) 126:14 noted (4) 30:11;37:4;93:21; 94:25 noteholder (2) 100:6;105:10 noteholders (3) 63:5,7;100:2 notes (2) 36:25;85:4 notice (128) 10:5;13:7,8,11,17, 24:14;7,14,15;17:16; 20:5,16,17,19;21:2;	31:18,20,25;32:4,20, 24:33:2,4,5,9,9,24; 34:16,20;35:11,14; 36:3;39:25;40:5,8; 41:15,17,23;42:9,20; 43:17,19,23,25;44:9, 12,14;46:3,6,9,15;47:7, 8;49:6;50:10;51:11; 52:9,11,11,14,15,23; 53:15,17,20;54:4,5,13, 13,16,16,17,23,24; 55:4,15,24;56:6,8,16, 18,20;57:1,2,7,11,23, 25;58:4,9,13,14,19,20, 21,25;59:23,25;60:10; 63:6;64:14,18,25;66:7; 73:12;83:21;85:20,22; 86:9;87:7;94:15,25; 95:1,3,3,5,7,8,9,12,12, 13,13,16,23;97:21; 105:16;107:10 noticed (1) 127:22 notices (5) 13:8;33:13;38:16; 41:21;44:2 noticing (3) 49:4;59:6;118:8 notified (1) 22:21 notify (1) 52:6 notifying (1) 22:20 notion (2) 22:22;44:14 notorious (1) 10:19 nowhere (1) 33:20 nuances (1) 13:3 number (7) 20:7;25:16,18;41:7; 55:10;66:10;120:2 nuts (2) 99:12;110:1	106:6;108:17;109:9; 114:2,8,10;115:9; 128:25;131:2 objectors (1) 108:21 obligation (2) 41:17;121:15 obligations (2) 41:18;77:5 observe (1) 65:24 observed (1) 66:4 obtained (1) 91:24 obvious (5) 11:1;24:25;69:18; 85:24;86:11 obviously (5) 14:25;18:8;68:11; 81:18;114:16 occurred (1) 47:4 October (2) 46:1;69:22 off (12) 16:24;32:13;43:4; 72:7;76:4;79:6;96:2; 120:4;126:7;127:25; 128:4,5 offering (1) 90:1 office (4) 104:5,7;112:21; 119:3 officers (10) 11:19;29:24;36:14; 41:4;72:13;74:2;77:12; 78:19;79:14;80:11 official (2) 116:10,17 often (1) 18:12 OII (1) 111:4 omissions (2) 80:7,14 one (45) 16:21;18:14;19:1; 20:7;25:16;27:25; 31:13;32:23;33:19; 35:24;38:22;40:13; 43:12;44:1;46:11;47:4; 54:4;55:10,13;56:1; 63:24;64:18;65:16; 67:10,18;71:1;78:25; 80:14;81:12;85:8; 94:22;95:19;96:12; 98:7;102:11,12;109:1, 20;117:1;123:5; 125:20;126:9,11; 129:14;130:23 one's (1)	72:18 only (17) 11:4;12:3,22;13:17; 27:1;46:11;51:13; 57:25;65:2;66:8;70:13; 84:23;96:23,23; 115:11,15;122:19 onto (1) 28:17 onus (1) 44:3 oOo- (1) 8:3 operates (1) 12:21 operative (3) 18:18;32:17;109:21 opinion (1) 28:22 opinions (1) 55:5 opportunity (8) 20:11;21:14,25; 28:25;30:18;100:25; 116:12;124:17 opposed (1) 86:4 opposition (2) 78:10;79:1 opt (2) 15:15;16:4 option (2) 15:15;128:24 options (1) 77:2 oral (2) 26:9;27:8 order (34) 8:4;9:24;35:9;47:8; 51:17,19,19,21;62:5; 63:18;82:23;90:22; 94:3,10,13,16;97:9; 102:5,9,13;103:23; 105:6;109:11;111:2; 122:18,20,23;123:2,3, 21;124:6;125:18,19; 128:25 ordered (1) 20:10 orders (3) 97:20;100:16;123:7 ordinary (2) 42:22;82:2 original (2) 59:23;113:12 originally (1) 36:15 Os (2) 74:13;80:6 others (9) 18:20;20:7;96:15; 100:2;105:8;114:19; 116:12;118:17;123:12	otherwise (2) 88:14;105:2 ours (1) 91:1 out (61) 15:15;16:4;19:6,20; 20:7;23:9;24:8;35:11, 13;37:8;10;38:14,15, 16;39:18;42:7,16,17, 24;46:25;47:2,14; 51:10;52:12;54:11; 55:7,10;56:17,24;57:4, 7;59:7;65:1,3,9,10; 66:24;67:2,9;72:17; 78:18;80:12,22;86:17; 88:13;89:13,21;91:9; 94:7,8;95:3,4,23; 109:9;117:15;119:13; 121:5;124:17;126:19, 21;130:21 outcome (4) 12:23;73:25;95:20; 96:1 outline (1) 96:20 outset (5) 37:4;38:23;39:9,13; 43:17 outside (1) 36:20 over (8) 10:21;15:24;16:3; 27:17;56:3,3;68:20; 127:19 overly (1) 18:3 owed (3) 93:23,23,24 own (14) 12:9;16:5;20:11; 51:15;52:16,20;55:19; 64:7;73:5;78:19;84:24; 95:11;126:23;127:25 owners (3) 49:22;50:7,23 owning (1) 51:24	P
				package (3) 46:20,22;117:25 packets (1) 94:7 page (4) 32:9;46:11;77:22,22 pages (3) 53:13;79:1;116:21 paid (2) 30:17;99:8 paper (2) 57:4,20 papers (22)	

11:2,17;18:2;22:12; 29:7;31:22;33:3;36:8; 41:19;46:7,17,18,20; 53:13;58:11,15;66:11; 73:18;91:18;97:23; 124:16;125:8	path (2) 101:22;118:13	68:9	68:4;71:5,7;72:3; 75:17;76:3;84:2,19; 85:6;89:15;97:17,17; 98:11;100:6,7,11,19, 23;101:1,2,8,12,13,17; 102:3,17,22,25;103:13, 18;104:6;105:9,17; 111:8,24;112:17; 113:13;118:16;121:6, 9,11;127:10	27:7;75:4
parade (1) 91:8	possible (3) 31:16;34:15;81:3			
Paradise (2) 44:8,12	possibly (1) 106:7			
paragraph (4) 46:11,12;47:6;51:17	post- (3) 47:13;72:7;118:1			
parallel (1) 10:13	post-confirmation (2) 79:11;91:13			
parent (1) 13:10	posted (1) 116:15			
pari (2) 48:13,14	post-petition (10) 18:18;65:16,25; 67:10;68:6;97:13; 100:20;101:2;102:1;			
part (16) 35:18;47:13;48:2; 51:18;57:11;58:6; 61:24;64:6;65:8;67:23; 71:10;76:1;85:25;86:1; 97:8;100:19	122:19			
participate (2) 90:1;115:9	potential (3) 64:19;84:22;85:1			
particular (7) 14:3;32:5;97:9; 102:18;105:6,11;122:2	potentially (3) 21:11;63:4;94:17			
particularly (4) 11:2;74:22;107:16; 110:12	Power (1) 79:3			
parties (14) 17:10;32:22;35:7; 62:18;69:10;72:14; 74:2;18;76:20;77:11, 12;78:19;102:15; 125:22	practical (3) 16:20;17:1;89:25			
parties' (1) 31:22	practically (1) 72:17			
parties-in-interest (1) 114:14	practice (1) 108:19			
partly (1) 117:4	pre (1) 97:13			
partner (1) 9:4	pre- (2) 17:25;45:21			
party (5) 32:19;75:22;22;81:7; 121:16	precedence (1) 16:3			
Pascuzzi (17) 109:16;112:6; 119:21,23,23;120:1,9, 15,18,22;121:1,3,9,22, 25;122:4;127:12	precedent (6) 36:19;41:10;57:14, 16;66:10;99:8			
pass (4) 18:25;19:21;42:2; 111:12	preceding (1) 77:13			
passing (1) 94:23	pre-certified (2) 53:25;54:1			
passu (2) 48:13,14	precipitous (1) 81:18			
past (2) 15:24;34:5	precise (1) 31:1			
	precisely (3) 76:9;91:3;94:9			
	precondition (1) 43:19			
	pre-confirmation (1) 76:2			
	predicate (1) 29:19			
	prediction (1) 68:11			
	predominantly (1) 50:25			
	preliminarily (1) 10:3			
	preliminary (4) 10:17;17:5;61:16; 109:7			
	premise (2)			

39:13,15	procedures (22) 35:2,6,15;36:16,23; 37:2,25;39:24;40:1; 41:13;85:23;105:15, 25;110:15;117:22; 118:8;126:18,24; 127:8,16;128:3;130:9	96:6 proposition (1) 28:23 propriety (1) 17:15 prosecute (1) 86:5 prospect (2) 23:8;29:4 prospective (1) 40:6 protect (1) 103:17 protected (4) 37:12,19;38:2,5 proves (1) 76:24 provide (7) 27:2;32:20;33:4,9,9; 41:17;71:9 provided (3) 17:16;58:13;102:24 provision (1) 35:9 PSLRA (2) 92:19,22 Public (9) 8:21;32:11,11;38:22; 40:13;41:3;77:24; 107:12;118:10 publication (10) 33:5;34:16,19;43:17; 44:2;53:17;57:8;58:1, 9;91:19 publicly (4) 38:13;40:7;42:16; 92:6 publishing (1) 58:14 pulling (1) 119:13 Pullo's (1) 51:10 purchase (1) 11:9 purchased (1) 90:14 purchasers (5) 22:21;33:20;53:19; 90:12;92:7 pure (1) 25:17 purpose (1) 18:7 purposes (11) 11:18;12:16;19:14; 22:17;25:1,5,11,13; 56:22;91:11;114:22 pursuant (2) 18:19;121:16 pursue (1) 16:4 pursued (1)	79:12 pushed (1) 69:19 pushing (1) 60:4 put (21) 28:10;36:13;37:6; 52:8;56:8;72:7;76:4; 79:24;80:20,22;83:4; 95:3,4,12;101:1; 103:13;106:5;112:10; 127:24,24;129:13 putative (5) 14:12;30:8;46:24; 47:3;58:6 puts (1) 121:6 putting (2) 68:2;77:18	reach (3) 35:1;68:13;74:24 reached (3) 40:18;94:7;100:1 reaching (1) 42:24 read (12) 11:17;17:7;36:8; 43:10;69:4,4;77:19; 91:18;104:22,24; 110:3;116:16 reading (4) 36:24;46:18;47:2; 116:13 ready (1) 117:23 reality (3) 16:5;40:11;42:18 realization (1) 83:17 realize (4) 16:7;18:22;68:7; 75:1 really (22) 11:5;21:24;23:1; 24:16;43:4;52:13;56:2, 13;60:20;62:15,16; 64:7;66:14,14;72:3,18; 86:3;90:7;91:12;99:2; 119:12,17 reason (9) 18:8;24:21;38:7; 41:10;65:12;103:6,13; 122:19,22 reasonable (9) 35:1;41:24;42:21; 50:11;95:7,8,17,17; 113:10 reasonable-minimum (1) 42:3 reasonably (3) 32:19;34:25;53:18 reasoning (1) 19:10 reasons (5) 60:6;69:18,20;82:10; 103:22 Rebecca (1) 126:13 rebuttal (2) 10:9;30:3 recall (4) 40:16;46:6;47:11; 109:15 receive (5) 32:3;42:20;56:6,8; 71:9 received (3) 57:25;58:8;72:6 receiving (2) 72:3;117:25 recent (1) 97:11
----------	--	---	--	--

recently (1) 49:10	relied (1) 46:6	reputation (1) 16:23	101:8	111:11;116:13
Recess (1) 131:8	relief (2) 23:2;72:19	request (2) 100:22;127:25	revisit (1) 130:3	Rosa (1) 44:8
recognition (1) 61:22	rely (2) 33:5;54:5	requested (1) 23:2	Richard (1) 45:11	Rose (1) 126:14
recognize (1) 81:2	relying (1) 47:7	require (1) 114:23	Richardson (46) 45:4;50:17;70:20,21, 22,23;71:4,25;72:2,11, 20;73:1,8,20,21,25; 74:4,9,17;75:2,4,13,15, 25;76:3,6,14,20,23; 77:18,20;78:8;81:11, 14,21;82:1,14,16,22; 83:2,4,6,13,20;84:7; 88:13	rowing (1) 119:11
recognized (2) 61:25;62:4	remained (1) 77:3	required (3) 57:11;64:7;85:6	Richardson (46) 45:4;50:17;70:20,21, 22,23;71:4,25;72:2,11, 20;73:1,8,20,21,25; 74:4,9,17;75:2,4,13,15, 25;76:3,6,14,20,23; 77:18,20;78:8;81:11, 14,21;82:1,14,16,22; 83:2,4,6,13,20;84:7; 88:13	RSA (18) 69:10;71:8,12;100:6, 17,17,25;105:10; 117:19;118:12;128:9, 11,13;129:8,15;130:1, 1;131:1
recommendations (1) 123:7	remaining (1) 17:18	requirement (2) 80:8;115:8	rid (1) 21:8	RSAs (4) 118:11;127:23; 128:6;130:4
reconcile (1) 93:9	remains (1) 89:11	requirements (2) 53:21;114:13	right (100) 8:16,23;11:7,13,15; 12:6;14:19;15:4,12; 16:13,18;17:13,20;	rubric (1) 32:25
reconciled (3) 57:15,16;58:17	remanded (1) 95:21	requires (2) 82:22;95:15	Rule (27) 8:10,17;15:14,15; 16:11;17:12;18:7; 21:19;22:24;24:22; 25:17;26:25;64:8,17; 70:25;82:2,17,20,20, 20,22;95:14,22;102:9; 108:6;114:16;123:24	Rule (27) 8:10,17;15:14,15; 16:11;17:12;18:7; 21:19;22:24;24:22; 25:17;26:25;64:8,17; 70:25;82:2,17,20,20, 20,22;95:14,22;102:9; 108:6;114:16;123:24
reconsideration (3) 100:15,15;128:16	remarks (1) 31:5	requisite (2) 117:17,18	ruled (5) 102:25;103:3,3,11, 15	ruled (5) 102:25;103:3,3,11, 15
record (8) 13:10;14:3;22:16; 33:19;40:1;50:1;51:11; 94:6	remedied (1) 96:5	reserve (6) 10:6;27:16;43:3; 44:22;102:18;103:10	Rules (7) 21:23;36:16;69:15; 108:6,7;110:15;130:18	Rules (7) 21:23;36:16;69:15; 108:6,7;110:15;130:18
records (6) 49:17,21;51:1,2; 57:21;81:25	remember (10) 37:9;41:6,8;58:21; 59:23;60:17;70:6;98:3; 122:25;123:4	reserved (1) 62:17	respecting (1) 120:13	ruling (17) 20:8;47:11,12,13; 61:16;65:14,18,23; 83:23;93:17;103:17; 122:18,23;123:22; 125:13,14;130:3
recover (2) 78:20;121:15	remembering (1) 65:21	respect (20) 15:14;22:2;25:19; 100:19,21;122:22	respect (20) 16:1;26:25;30:8; 32:17;38:10;41:22; 42:12;87:8,10;88:19; 91:3,16;92:5;100:5,16, 20;101:25;104:5; 107:11;119:12	run (1) 44:3
recovery (5) 26:1,1;30:20;74:15; 77:8	reminding (1) 62:7	respond (3) 94:23;97:7;115:25	running (2) 10:13;129:25	running (2) 10:13;129:25
reduced (2) 48:5,8	renewed (1) 127:23	response (1) 11:2	rush (1) 25:14	run (1) 44:3
refer (2) 42:22;108:9	re-notice (1) 29:4	responsible (1) 121:16	S	running (2) 10:13;129:25
referred (2) 43:18;85:22	reopen (1) 95:24	restructuring (5) 79:17,23;99:25; 100:4;101:21	safari (1) 55:22	sale (1) 11:9
refile (3) 129:12,13;130:6	reorganization (1) 43:25	result (2) 78:23;83:14	sailing (1) 55:19	same (20) 32:9;39:24;40:6;
reflect (1) 101:8	reorganized (3) 84:24;88:7;89:20	resume (4) 96:22;116:5;120:5; 131:7	sake (1) 89:10	45:23;46:7;58:12;60:5;
reflected (2) 77:5;80:25	repeat (2) 65:16;93:12	Retirement (1) 8:22	risks (1) 102:11	61:1,2;72:14,14,15;
regard (1) 32:9	repeatedly (1) 126:19	return (1) 63:18	road (2) 20:25;81:4	79:15;83:8;98:18;
regular (1) 119:10	reply (3) 21:22;30:6;40:4	reversed (2) 68:6;95:21	robust (4) 49:4;59:6;66:7; 85:20	106:25;108:16;112:9;
regulated (1) 79:3	report (1) 119:9	review (3) 100:25;110:6;127:7	robustness (1) 58:19	119:11;128:15
rehash (1) 99:2	reporter (2) 31:9,11	representative (1) 66:2	room (5) 38:24;52:20;106:17;	SAN (5)
related (6) 18:25;87:7;95:19; 120:19;122:21;127:8	represent (2) 11:25;63:13	representatives (6) 59:11,12;91:21,25; 106:24;120:24	revised (1)	
relates (1) 92:2	representation (1) 21:15	represented (3) 59:13;79:10;126:21		
relatively (3) 106:13,19;125:16	representative (1) 66:2	representing (1) 10:23		
relevance (2) 70:25;72:11	representatives (6) 59:11,12;91:21,25; 106:24;120:24			
relevant (3) 11:21;21:21;32:12	represented (3) 59:13;79:10;126:21			
reliance (1) 81:22	representing (1) 10:23			

8:1;44:7;97:24;98:4; 4 Sandler (1) 8:21 Santa (1) 44:8 satisfied (2) 112:8;119:5 satisfies (1) 123:25 satisfy (5) 47:8;87:14;91:20; 111:25;119:1 save (2) 17:18;102:1 saw (1) 127:22 saying (7) 36:12;37:1;54:20; 68:5;80:22;81:11; 105:3 scale (1) 103:10 schedule (6) 97:22;113:10,25; 114:9;116:5;126:24 scheduled (2) 26:10;33:16 scheduling (9) 25:13;96:13;109:4, 111:113:4;114:22,24; 121:2,11 Schrag (1) 33:14 Schwab (6) 52:3,5,6,15;94:3; 95:10 scope (3) 39:23;125:15;130:24 scream (1) 27:23 Seas (1) 42:8 seated (1) 8:7 seats (2) 9:19,20 second (4) 21:9;34:14;64:6; 68:20 seconds (3) 34:13;43:9,13 Section (2) 38:9;111:12 securities (32) 13:4;21:7;23:15; 24:1;25:17;27:9;33:19, 21:35;3,3,14;36:4,22; 37:6,16;38:3;41:15; 49:19;53:8,15;59:11; 65:4;72:12;73:9;76:23; 77:9;79:16;80:3,8; 91:20;92:18;95:14	securities- (1) 38:8 securities-fraud (2) 12:15;90:13 securities-litigation (1) 23:16 security (1) 11:9 seeing (2) 57:8;118:19 seeking (6) 37:6;48:4;74:7;86:3; 99:25;105:14 seem (4) 21:16;24:23,25;92:3 seems (4) 12:19;56:21;117:1; 131:1 sees (1) 95:4 segue (1) 35:23 sell (1) 79:6 Semtech (4) 76:24;77:1;78:13; 81:5 Senate (1) 10:14 senators (1) 10:22 send (7) 35:11,13;52:12,15; 56:17;57:4;94:8 sending (3) 36:3;63:24;123:16 senior (4) 67:7;98:1,10;100:1 sense (4) 11:7;16:20;47:19; 60:14 sent (7) 46:20;22;51:8,10,11; 94:7;116:15 separate (11) 29:23;78:11,24;80:9, 17:82:24;84:1;91:7; 126:25;130:5,6 separately (1) 79:22 sequence (1) 107:5 serious (2) 127:3,4 seriously (1) 116:15 serve (3) 38:3,14;52:5 served (3) 44:13;46:3;50:2 service (1) 19:5 sessions (1)	120:7 set (12) 21:21;22:15;35:6; 70:3;100:2;102:18; 105:25;115:1;121:10; 126:23;128:8;130:4 sets (1) 63:3 setting (3) 105:6,16;114:12 settled (1) 27:13 settlement (7) 15:14;25:25;35:8; 67:7;86:13;101:11; 103:25 settlements (2) 35:8;40:9 seven-year (1) 57:23 several (6) 27:9;28:22;39:21; 85:5;104:18;118:10 share (5) 30:14,18;45:1;64:21; 90:15 shareholder (4) 34:5,6;49:11;82:5 shareholders (11) 40:8;54:6;78:9,22; 79:15,22,25;80:16; 81:2,6;107:12 shares (13) 22:14,18;32:10;52:2, 4;79:25;80:3,3;81:19; 87:13;88:13,14;95:11 sharing (1) 45:2 shift (1) 16:24 short (3) 96:23;122:13,15 shortened (2) 129:19;130:24 shortly (2) 45:25;86:15 shot (1) 128:6 show (5) 80:9,16;111:9;112:3, 10 showed (1) 39:7 shown (1) 78:14 shows (1) 39:5 sic (10) 23:20;27:11;29:21; 39:7;46:18;53:19; 56:24;59:2;86:24;87:1 side (11) 9:20;13:7;29:17;	41:1;44:23;45:2;55:2; 60:9,22;68:9;115:4 sides (1) 40:25 side's (1) 92:25 sign (1) 124:6 signed (1) 71:20 significant (4) 27:4,5;61:21;91:14 signing (1) 89:25 similar (1) 78:25 simple (7) 34:1;59:25;91:15; 103:7;106:13,19;110:9 simplified (2) 99:13;117:6 simply (3) 41:16;78:23;128:4 single (3) 13:15;47:4;80:6 sit (1) 68:24 site (1) 53:22 situation (3) 14:22;45:17;49:19 situations (1) 82:3 six (3) 47:6;50:13;83:7 six-and-a-half (1) 33:12 six-month (1) 46:4 Slack (99) 44:24,25;45:4,6,8,10, 11,11,16;46:17;47:18; 48:2,10,12,15,17,21, 24;49:1,12,14,19,24; 50:1,5,7,14,19,22;51:8, 10;52:1,7,18,22,25; 53:2,10;54:15,19,22; 55:9,12,21;56:23; 58:24;59:4,17,19; 60:11,13,19;61:3,6,8, 12;62:9,11,13,19,24; 63:2,9,12,14,20,23; 64:1,3,5,11;65:19,22; 66:1,4,18,20,23;67:1, 12,16,20;68:1,20,22; 69:13,25;70:2,6,16,18, 19;71:1;85:9,15;91:17; 94:22,25;95:20 slice (3) 88:22;89:1;90:3 smaller (2) 58:6;121:17 smooth (1)	101:22 so-called (1) 98:2 sold (5) 19:4,4;32:10,12;83:8 solely (1) 82:6 solicit (1) 107:20 solicitation (2) 105:15;107:7 solicited (1) 23:6 solution (1) 29:4 solve (1) 131:5 solved (1) 94:17 solvency (2) 39:14;40:14 solvent (1) 41:3 somebody (16) 15:22;32:10;41:1; 43:25;44:5,13;49:9; 50:12;51:20;55:21; 67:18;88:23;95:4; 119:1,4;123:1 someone (4) 45:1;49:10;56:19; 115:4 someone's (1) 68:3 sometimes (2) 26:4;66:24 somewhat (1) 18:10 somewhere (1) 9:23 soon (1) 118:12 so-ordered (1) 18:20 sorry (6) 51:3;69:23;96:18; 120:6;128:2;129:4 sort (4) 20:20;33:22;97:7; 117:14 sought (2) 45:19;86:10 sound (1) 87:25 sounds (3) 70:14;87:25;88:17 South (2) 42:8;98:4 Southern (2) 23:5;57:19 speak (6) 13:15;14:10,12;31:8, 15;78:4
---	--	--	---	--

SPEAKER (2) 9:15;107:2	23:5;56:14;67:8; 71:17;80:22;94:4;	126:22 stop (3) 93:2;129:24,24	127:1 suggest (3) 45:24;51:15;105:24	tainted (1) 65:16
speaking (2) 72:17;125:16	96:25;97:18;99:3,13, 14,15;104:15;105:14,	story (1) 116:20	suggested (1) 104:20	talk (19) 10:22;17:24;19:3; 22:23;27:3;31:19;32:4;
special (2) 121:10,11	15,25;106:9;107:7;	straight (2) 116:7,20	suggesting (3) 35:12;60:15;110:10	33:6,12,34:21;40:4; 47:21;57:17;66:16;
specialize (2) 35:23;41:15	109:6,14;110:24; 111:8,18;113:12,14,17;	streamline (1) 117:24;120:12;122:1;	suggestion (2) 114:15;123:23	67:21;98:25;108:24; 115:3;127:13
specializes (1) 36:3	126:25;127:1,11	statements (5) 107:19	suits (1) 125:24	talked (9) 10:6;19:2;26:8;29:7; 56:2,18;57:4,13;61:19
specific (2) 33:19;115:4	77:4;82:12;106:17; 117:16;118:14	street (5) 41:4;51:24;55:16; 58:16;79:5	sum (1) 61:19	talking (15) 11:4;13:16;24:10; 51:17;52:13;59:24;
specifically (4) 13:14;53:14;55:13; 112:6	10:14;24:18	strength (1) 94:16	summary (2) 108:9;114:6	60:1,1;62:24,25;63:2;
speculate (2) 42:14;114:2	8:11;86:3;10;97:1; 108:20;115:6	stressed (1) 114:19	summer (1) 118:20	65:4;98:5;121:13;
spend (2) 43:7,12	statute (1) 111:15	stretch (1) 94:12	Super (1) 115:18	127:16
spent (2) 13:6,7	statute-of-limitations (1) 19:14	structure (1) 98:23	superior (1) 30:7	target (2) 97:22;127:10
spilled (1) 31:21	statutory (1) 121:15	struggling (1) 21:10	supplemental (1) 13:8	targeted (1) 44:2
split (2) 10:4;45:8	stay (11) 16:13,14;37:11,12, 19:38:2,5;72:19;91:5; 92:19,22	studied (1) 66:12	support (6) 99:25;100:4;101:17, 21:111:22;112:13	targets (1) 97:16
spoke (2) 95:10;98:7	stayed (1) 21:7	stuff (2) 16:24;109:19	Suppose (2) 73:16;75:21	TCC (23) 11:3;18:3,6,10,12; 21:16;45:2,6;57:5;
squeeze (4) 9:21;129:15;131:1,3	stem (1) 83:16	styled (1) 80:7	supposed (5) 35:20;36:21;121:21, 22:123:16	58:24,25;59:13;70:23;
Stafford (1) 121:16	step (3) 43:15;95:7;124:21	subject (11) 14:21;64:23;92:19; 97:19;100:3;103:23;	Supreme (1) 19:12	71:8;87:20;88:8;99:4; 106:24;110:4;117:17;
stage (4) 28:9;67:22;69:3; 84:2	steps (3) 37:3;91:21;95:5	105:8;106:25;108:18; 123:7;125:3	Sure (28) 9:1;34:2;36:9;38:23;	19:118:11;130:4
stake (1) 28:4	Steven (1) 84:14	submission (2) 110:16;111:19	39:16;42:1;68:14;	TCC's (6) 29:22;79:11;87:8;
stand (4) 37:21;42:13,18; 112:16	stick (2) 29:18;116:5	submissions (1) 114:13	88:3,5;127:16	88:3,5;127:16
standard (3) 51:23;61:18,19	still (23) 19:23;21:8;28:25; 32:1;37:18,18;39:9,15;	submit (3) 18:16;97:5;125:8	team (1) 116:16	team (1) 116:16
standing (2) 24:10;120:3	41:18;56:10,11;58:9; 71:19;72:18;73:18,18;	submitted (2) 36:5;96:9	technically (1) 74:11	technically (1) 74:11
standpoint (6) 16:5;39:17;40:10; 44:19;84:23,24	96:4,5;112:2;118:25; 123:10;125:15;130:20	submitting (1) 112:13	teed (1) 97:14	teeing (1) 125:17
stands (1) 96:9	stipulated (1) 40:19	subordinated (10) 23:18,20;30:20;38:9;	telecom (2) 79:7,7	telephone (1) 106:18
start (6) 39:4;45:13;70:24; 76:8;96:22;115:4	stipulation (2) 18:19;119:3	48:9,10,11,12;74:11; 89:18	telling (3) 36:19;51:19;81:23	telling (3) 36:19;51:19;81:23
started (5) 23:8;28:7;77:25; 126:19,21	stock (43) 19:4;30:13;39:9;	subrogation (3) 33:16;100:17;130:4	temporarily (1) 63:20	temporarily (1) 63:20
starts (1) 51:17	52:16,20;60:25;71:10, 14,16,22;72:6;77:2,6,7;	subsection (1) 38:4	ten (8) 10:7;30:25;44:22;	ten (8) 10:7;30:25;44:22;
state (9) 13:14;36:18;77:16; 98:22;105:1;109:16; 119:23;121:7,18	78:15;79:8;80:12,19, 24:81;22;82:4,11;83:7,	subsequent (1) 111:19	45:8;52:2,4;84:8;97:3	45:8;52:2,4;84:8;97:3
stated (2) 73:1;103:22	9:87:11,12,13;88:7; 89:9,10,13,14,19,21;	subset (3) 20:20;46:23;47:3	tens (4) 40:5;42:19;99:14;	tens (4) 40:5;42:19;99:14;
statement (32) 73:1;103:22	90:3,9,9,12,14;94:6; 99:7;117:2,4	substantially (2) 85:1;106:16	107:11	107:11
statement (32) 73:1;103:22	stockbroker (1) 52:21	successful (1) 85:6	tentative (10) 29:11;47:12;12;49:2;	tentative (10) 29:11;47:12;12;49:2;
	stonewalled (1)	sue (1) 73:4	3;65:14,18,22;91:5;	3;65:14,18,22;91:5;
		sufficient (4) 55:25;93:18;107:16;	93:17	93:17
			T	term (1) 114:22
				terminated (1)

45:19	throwing (1)	touched (1)	78:21;79:11,13;88:15, 16,16;98:23,23,24; 110:2;117:4,20; 118:20;120:10,19; 121:7;126:17,18; 127:2,7,8,16,16	
termination (1)	56:24	21:25	118:20;120:10,19;	U
47:4	thus (1)	touchstone (1)	121:7;126:17,18;	
terms (16)	53:20	34:23	127:2,7,8,16,16	ultimate (1)
18:21;25:2,6,6;34:1; 45:23;48:17;59:6; 65:14;92:22;100:23; 103:7;105:10;109:14; 115:11;121:2	ticket (1)	tough-enough (1)	112:14	
terribly (1)	67:10	10:23	ultimately (2)	
85:9	ticking (1)	touts (1)	15:10;27:11	
test (5)	66:17	40:3	Um (1)	
42:3;56:24,25;57:1, 11	tight (1)	toward (3)	105:22	
testimony (1)	131:3	101:22;106:20; 118:15	unaddressed (1)	
57:5	timely (4)	town (1)	94:24	
Thanks (1)	13:13;23:14;86:17;	52:3	unaffected (1)	
70:19	108:1	toxic-tort (1)	89:23	
that'll (2)	timely-filed (1)	21:4	unchanged (1)	
40:22;53:4	17:14	track (2)	128:11	
theoretically (2)	times (5)	24:22;104:12	unclear (1)	
45:23;49:17	27:9;55:17;58:15; 130:14,15	trade (4)	13:20	
therefore (10)	timetable (7)	97:12;101:24;122:9, 10	under (20)	
12:21;13:11,18;47:6; 73:16;75:11;76:8;77:6; 83:20;86:2	10:15;68:12;104:14, 17,21;105:5,6	traded (6)	15:14;30:9;32:25; 33:15;38:9;40:6;41:25; 45:23;53:16,17;72:3;	
there're (1)	timing (12)	22:14,18;38:13;40:7; 42:16;92:6	74:11;75:14;77:9; 78:10;79:16;88:12;	
55:4	9:25;10:11;18:21; 21:17;22:23;23:13; 61:20;64:1,3;65:11; 71:5;86:21	trading (1)	89:15;118:11;123:24	
thinking (1)	today (23)	39:9	underlying (1)	
108:3	9:2;11:21;12:16; 13:5,15;14:11;16:8; 19:6;20:20;31:23;	traditional (2)	9:11	
third (7)	42:18;73:2;76:1;85:23; 86:2,7,13;105:7; 112:25;127:19,24; 128:1;130:21	16:11;101:11	understood (6)	
18:21;50:9;65:1; 72:14;74:2;77:12; 78:19	today's (6)	trained (1)	14:4;31:3;32:2;	
thirteen (1)	11:18;12:23;55:7; 56:22;69:24;99:20	110:11	37:13;60:13;129:12	
117:17	to-do (2)	transaction (1)	undertake (1)	
thirty (5)	97:7;99:1	79:19	95:8	
34:13;43:9,13;45:8; 55:18	together (2)	transactions (1)	undertaking (1)	
though (10)	36:13;117:25	78:4	107:13	
28:16;33:22;49:1; 54:23;55:15;66:4,14; 74:11;102:23;120:16	told (8)	116:13	undisclosed (2)	
thought (4)	43:1;76:23;80:14; 81:25;82:6;113:11; 115:5;128:9	translate (1)	77:2,4	
59:17;73:17;103:9; 126:20	tolled (1)	25:11	undisputed (1)	
thousand (1)	19:14	translates (1)	58:3	
33:17	tolling (2)	25:14	undue (1)	
thousands (8)	19:12;29:1	treat (1)	22:25	
20:6;21:25;40:5; 42:19;60:12;99:14; 107:11;119:6	took (4)	103:14	UNIDENTIFIED (2)	
three (12)	19:11;37:3;109:19, 19	treated (2)	9:15;107:2	
17:10;18:13;55:14, 22:57:24;58:15;65:1; 66:24;77:23;98:18; 130:14,15	top (2)	treatment (8)	UNISON (1)	
threshold (2)	23:10;108:13	23:19;57:18;69:6; 93:1;100:19;101:5,9; 105:11	8:6	
17:12;26:24	tort (5)	trial (1)	United (1)	
threw (1)	78:16;100:16; 107:17;116:10;117:18	109:3	10:14	
57:7	total (1)	trick (2)	unknown (1)	
throughout (1)	89:22	119:3;124:7	30:20	
69:16	totally (1)	tried (3)	unless (10)	
	90:7	106:19,19;130:15	12:19;15:2;16:3; 19:9,20;43:3;80:16; 90:1;119:15;123:12	
	touch (3)	Troy (1)	unlike (1)	
	22:13;79:1,2	109:17	21:1	
		true (9)	unlikely (1)	
		32:15,22,23;34:14; 56:4;65:20;79:20; 82:13;99:4	16:6	
		truly (1)	unliquidated (1)	
		32:5	75:23	
		trust (27)	unopened (1)	
		71:9;72:3,6;75:16;	60:5	
			unrelated (1)	
			97:23	
			unresolved (1)	
			91:13	

up (44)	17:8;24:10;28:6,14, 19;39:5;60:24;61:12; 65:13;66:22;67:20; 75:8,16;79:8;84:17,18; 85:1;86:12,14,19; 90:10,18;92:12;95:25; 96:1;97:5,14;107:19, 25;108:2;112:16; 114:23;120:3,20,24; 123:8,16,18;125:6,6, 17;127:18;129:20; 130:19	97:17;102:17	8:18	Winthrop (8)	52:16
versus (3)	13:5;110:16,16		Water (1)	126:2,3,12,13,14; 127:7,13,20	
vet (1)	30:19		waterfall (1)	wish (4)	Y
vetted (2)	65:14;126:25		23:20	17:6;114:3;124:24; 128:9	year (4)
victim (8)	71:9;75:16;78:5,6, 21;89:1;118:18;121:7		wave (1)	100:9,11,12,14,21	years (8)
victims (12)	44:3;59:13,23;71:15, 18,22;88:20;89:4,11, 19;116:25;121:13		96:2	withdraw (5)	13:16;15:24;28:22; 49:10;55:18;57:24; 66:24;77:3
victim's (1)	88:15		way (34)	100:9,11,12,14,21	Yep (2)
view (10)	33:24;47:15;49:9; 69:16;94:25;103:21, 25;106:8;107:11; 125:17		11:6;13:10;21:2; 23:24;31:15;37:20,23; 47:24;49:14;52:20; 56:18;60:2;62:20;63:6; 67:15;73:19;78:9;83:4; 93:7;99:18,19;102:16, 19;103:11;106:1; 107:17;111:9;112:6; 114:21;115:21;120:2; 123:4;125:9;127:12	102:16;107:7	yesterday (2)
Villegas (1)	9:12		ways (6)	102:16;107:7	yield (1)
violation (1)	119:1		63:20,21;64:10; 116:24;123:5;124:14	13:1,3;18:4;94:13	York (3)
violations (2)	80:2,15		website (4)	35:23	19:11;55:16;58:15
virtue (1)	90:18		40:3;108:12;116:17, 17	woodwork (1)	
voice (1)	112:14		WEDNESDAY (1)	23:9	Z
vote (16)	63:17,17,18;67:2; 68:4;69:1;71:18,19; 79:17,21,22;107:9,16; 111:24,24;119:8		8:1	words (6)	
votes (4)	23:6;107:20;108:1,3		week (3)	13:14;36:18;38:2; 56:14;58:25;66:8	Zeiss (1)
voting (7)	48:3;63:21;91:11; 105:25;107:11;108:15; 110:7		67:7;105:10;127:10	9:14	
V			weeks (3)	zero (1)	
vacuum (1)	18:10		23:11;37:4;126:22	76:10	
Valley (1)	98:3		weight (1)		1
valuable (1)	78:21		18:12	working (6)	
valuation (2)	65:8;88:6		Weil (1)	107:17,24;110:4; 114:25;117:19;118:3	1 (8)
value (20)	47:24;65:3;71:18; 72:2;74:12;79:25; 80:19;87:11,12,21; 88:2,8,19,22;89:9,11, 11,12,13,19		84:14	47:5;58:6;69:14,17; 120:21	17:19;39:25;46:4;
variety (2)	77:13;90:13		weren't (15)	works (12)	47:5;58:6;69:14,17;
various (3)	33:3;98:22;117:15		37:12;39:18;44:8; 50:16,18;59:20;60:16; 61:5;67:6;73:11;81:10, 11;83:9;120:19;129:21	28:15,19;50:6;84:17, 18;85:2;86:12,14,19; 95:25;96:1;114:16	120:21
vegetation (3)	77:14,15;80:23		whack-a-mole (1)	world (12)	1:30 (6)
vendors (1)	33:16		117:14	33:5,18,22;34:24; 37:25;42:13;50:3;51:7, 24,24;63:10;95:4	96:14;120:4;128:8;
version (2)			what's (10)	130:19;131:7,8	130:19;131:7,8
W			41:2;53:23;55:6; 60:9;65:9;68:8;99:7; 111:4;122:13;124:21	worry (1)	
wage (1)	93:19		wherever (1)	98:2	10 (1)
wait (1)	86:12		54:13	worth (7)	89:10
waited (2)	62:2;86:9		whole (12)	62:21;67:24;68:23;	105 (3)
walked (1)	91:6		71:14;72:5;90:18; 104:17	71:14;72:5;90:18;	24:13;26:8;27:8
Wall (3)	55:16;58:16;79:5		worthless (1)	104:17	1054 (11)
Walter (1)	36:5		79:9	33:5,18,22;34:24; 37:25;42:13;50:3;51:7, 24,24;63:10;95:4	23:22;24:24;71:23;
Walter's (1)	51:16		wrap (1)	42:1;53:23;55:6; 60:9;65:9;68:8;99:7; 111:4;122:13;124:21	101:23;111:10,13,25;
wants (4)	29:17;116:1;122:16; 130:20		92:12	112:10,15;118:17;	112:10,15;118:17;
watch (1)			write (1)	119:2	
X			66:5	wrong (5)	
X			66:9	60:4;62:15;70:21; 95:2,2	1129 (2)
XYZ (1)			wrongdoing (1)	95:2,2	111:12;114:13
12:20 (1)			93:18	1141 (1)	
12:29 (1)			66:9	19:21	
				117 (1)	
				77:22	
				11th (3)	
				105:20;106:1;107:8	
				12:20 (1)	
				96:13	
				12:29 (1)	

131:8 12:30 (1) 120:3 15th (4) 62:5;107:9;108:16; 113:12 16 (1) 53:13 17 (1) 53:13 170 (1) 63:22 1982 (1) 92:4 1st (1) 33:20	128:8 2X (2) 88:11,12 3 3.3 (1) 121:14 30 (4) 58:8;104:13;122:24; 123:21 30th (2) 101:23;131:5 3rd (1) 129:1	7th (2) 105:13;127:11 8 8 (1) 79:1 9 9 (1) 51:17 9019 (1) 101:11 96 (1) 77:22 4 441 (1) 58:11 4th (13) 100:3;115:1,22; 125:4,5,6,22,25; 127:13,19;128:21,24; 129:1 5 500-page (1) 99:15 502 (1) 75:14 510b (14) 11:7,11,14;12:20; 23:18,22;38:10;39:2; 47:20,21;48:6;62:18; 73:6;74:12 510b-related (1) 47:16 54b (4) 102:5;123:6,24; 124:12 6 6.2 (1) 33:13 6.75 (1) 89:20 6th (1) 26:10 7 7 (1) 79:1 70,000 (1) 119:13 7023 (13) 8:10,17;15:15;17:12; 18:7;21:17,19;22:24; 26:25;28:9;46:1;69:13; 95:22	
2			